Gauging spatial symmetries and the classification of topological crystalline phases

Ryan Thorngren[1,2] and Dominic V. Else[3]

[1]*Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*
[2]*Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*
[3]*Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*

arXiv:1612.00846v4 [cond-mat.str-el] 3 Mar 2017

Abstract

We put the theory of interacting topological crystalline phases on a systematic footing. These are topological phases protected by space-group symmetries. Our central tool is an elucidation of what it means to "gauge" such symmetries. We introduce the notion of a *topological crystalline liquid*, and argue that most (and perhaps all) phases of interest are likely to satisfy this criterion. We prove a *Crystalline Equivalence Principle*, which states that in Euclidean space, topological crystalline liquids with symmetry group G are in one-to-one correspondence with topological phases protected by the same symmetry G, but acting *internally*, where if an element of G is orientation-reversing, it is realized as an anti-unitary symmetry in the internal symmetry group. As an example, we explicitly compute, using group cohomology, a partial classification of bosonic symmetry-protected topological (SPT) phases protected by crystalline symmetries in (3+1)-D for 227 of the 230 space groups. For the 65 space groups not containing orientation-reversing elements (Sohncke groups), there are no cobordism invariants which may contribute phases beyond group cohomology, and so we conjecture our classification is complete.

Symmetry is an important feature of many physical systems. Many phases of matter can be characterized in part by the way the symmetry is implemented. For example, liquids and solids are distinguished by whether or not they spontaneously break spatial symmetries. In fact, it was once thought that *all* known phases could be distinguished by their symmetries and that all continuous phase transitions were spontaneous symmetry breaking transitions. The discovery of *topological order*[1] showed that, at zero temperature, there are quantum phases of matter that can be distinguished by patterns of long-range entanglement without the need to invoke symmetry. However, even for topological phases symmetry is important. Any symmetry that is not spontaneously broken in a topological phase must have some action on the topological structure of the phase, and different such patterns can distinguish different phases. Even a phase of matter that is trivial without symmetry can become nontrivial when considering how symmetry is implemented. Topological phases distinguished by symmetry are known as *symmetry-enriched topological (SET)*[2–8] or *symmetry-protected topological (SPT)*[9–27] depending on whether they are nontrivial or trivial without symmetry, respectively.

For internal symmetries, which do not move points in space around, very general and powerful ways of understanding SPT and SET phases have been formulated in terms of mathematical notions such as group cohomology[17], category theory[7], and cobordisms[22, 28]. On the other hand, such techniques have not, so far, been extended to the case of *space group* symmetries. We refer to these topological phases enriched by space-group symmetries as *topological crystalline phases*. This is a significant omission because any system which arranges itself into a regular crystal lattice is invariant under one of 230 space groups in three dimensions. Fermionic phases of matter protected by space-group symmetries are called *topological crystalline insulators* [29–33]. Progress towards a general classification in free-fermion systems has been made [34–40] and some understanding of the effect of interactions been achieved [41–45]. Meanwhile, intrinsically strongly interacting phases protected by spatial symmetries have also been found [3, 7, 46–54]. In particular Ref. [55] gave an approach for deriving the general classification of interacting SPT phases protected by a group of spatial symmetries that leave a given point invariant. However, for SETs and/or general space groups, there is so far no systematic theory analogous to the one that exists for internal symmetries, except in one dimension [56].

Our goal in this paper is to fill this gap. Our starting point is an understanding of SPT or SET order of a system by studying its response to a gauge field. For example, SPTs in (2+1)-D protected by an internal $U(1)$ symmetry can be identified by the topological response to a $U(1)$ gauge field. All such possible responses are described by the Chern-Simons action

$$S = \frac{k}{4\pi} \int A \wedge dA. \tag{0.1}$$

The coefficient k has a physical interpretation as the quantized Hall conductance. Because it is quantized, it can only jump if the U(1) symmetry is broken or the gap closes. Further, since this is the only term that may appear, we learn that the different U(1) SPTs in 2+1D

are labelled by this integer. We call this procedure of coupling a G-symmetric system to a background G gauge field "gauging" the G symmetry, though strictly speaking we do not consider making the gauge field dynamical. Stricter terminology would call the dynamical gauge theory the result of gauging and our procedure the first step, called equivariantization, a mouthful, or pregauging. Many of the general approaches to SPT and SET phases can be formulated in terms of gauging[6, 7, 19, 57].

We want to apply similar approaches to the study of systems with spatial symmetry. So the first question we will ask is

Question 1. What does it mean to gauge a spatial symmetry?

We will give what we believe to be the definitive answer to this question, motivated by the intuition of "gauge fluxes" which for spatial symmetries are crystallographic defects such as dislocations and disclinations. There seems to be a natural generalization of this to symmetries which act on spacetime as well, such as time reversal symmetry or time translation. We will mention briefly this generalization and how the classification extends to these spacetime symmetries, where it agrees with known group cohomology classifications of time reversal-invariant and Floquet SPTs, respectively.

This approach to studying spatial symmetries will allow us to elucidate the general theory of crystalline topological phases. We first introduce the notion of a *topological crystalline liquid*, which roughly is a phase that, although crystalline, still preserves a certain degree of "fluidity" in the IR limit. The idea is motivated by the notion of "topological liquids" which have an IR limit that is described by a topological quantum field theory (TQFT), i.e. the long-range physics is only sensitive to the topology of the background manifold. This is in contrast to "fracton" topological phases[58–61] where no such topological IR limit exists[1]. Topological crystalline liquids are a generalization of topological liquids to systems with crystal symmetries. We will show explicitly that a large class of topological crystalline phases are in fact topological crystalline liquids.

We then are able to prove our main classification result:

> **Crystalline Equivalence Principle**: The classification of topological crystalline liquids with spatial symmetry group G is the *same* as the classification of topological phases with *internal* symmetry G.

Compare Ref. 62, where a similar principle was conjectured for symmetry groups containing *time translation symmetry*. This result holds for systems living on a *contractible* space, ie. Euclidean space in d dimensions. On other manifolds, for example Euclidean space with some holes, some new things happen. We note for this correspondence, orientation-reversing symmetries in the space group must correspond to anti-unitary symmetries in the internal group

[1] Although see Section III.

Number	Name	Classification
1	p1	0
2	p2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
3	pm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
4	pg	0
5	cm	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
6	p2mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
7	p2mg	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
8	p2gg	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
9	c2mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
10	p4	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{\times 2}$
11	p4mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
12	p4gm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
13	p3	$\mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 3}$
14	p3m1	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
15	p31m	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
16	p6	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 2}$
17	p6mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$

TABLE I. The classification of bosonic SPT phases in (2+1)-D protected by space group symmetries, for each of the 17 2-D space groups (sometimes known as "wallpaper groups").

As an example of results that one can deduce from this general principle, we find that bosonic SPT phases protected by orientation-preserving unitary spatial symmetry G are classified by the group cohomology $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G, \mathrm{U}(1))$, since that is the classification of internal SPTs with symmetry G (See Appendix C for more details on the definition of $\mathcal{H}$.) This agrees with a recent classification of a class of tensor networks with spatial symmetries[54]. In (3+1)-D, for space groups containing orientation-reversing transformations, this classification is expected to be incomplete, just as it is for internal symmetry groups containing anti-unitary symmetries[22]. The correspondence holds equally well for *fermionic* systems so, for example, one obtains a partial classification of fermionic SPT's protected by space-group symmetries from "group supercohomology" [23] and a complete classification of fermionic crystalline SPT's from cobordism theory [28], with some caveats. We attempt this in section IV B for crystalline topological superconductors and insulators.

Our results allow for the classification to be explicitly computed in many cases. For example, Table I shows the classification of bosonic SPT phases protected by space-group symmetry in (2+1)-D as obtained from group cohomology. For more details of how Table I was computed, and the (3+1)-D version of the table, see Appendix A.

The outline of our paper is as follows. In Section I we introduce the key concepts of our paper. In section I A we discuss our definition of crystalline gauge field. Then in I B we define the topological crystalline liquids. In I C we give a construction of many topological crystalline liquids from ordinary topological liquids. In I D we derive the Crystalline Equivalence Principle, which applies to the physically relevant case of phases of matter in contractible space $\mathbb{R}^d$. In I E we discuss extensions to non-contractible spaces and a general

classification result for crystalline gauge fields.

In section II we explore aspects of the topological response to crystalline gauge fields (including on non-contractible spaces). This allows us to state a general SPT classification in terms of equivariant cohomology in Section II. We derive several general structural results about the classification in Section III. We find that phases with translation symmetries can be "rolled up" to build equivalent phases on tori. We find new phases on non-contractible spaces which are "protected by topology" and give several examples in Section III B.

We give generalizations of our methods in Section IV, including Floquet phases in IV A and phases beyond ordinary equivariant cohomology in IV B. In IV C, we describe how our methods can be placed into a general context of position-dependent IR limit. This gives us a picture of what the most general crystalline symmetry enriched topological order can look like.

In Section V we discuss questions for future work. Finally, in the appendix we discuss a cellular version of crystalline gauge fields, the difference between topological terms and topological phases, and how to find equivariant cocycles and what to do with them.

We hope this paper will inspire the discovery of many curious quantum crystals.

I. CRYSTALLINE GAUGE FIELDS

A. Gauge fluxes and crystal defects

In order to understand crystalline topological phases, we want to study what it might mean to couple to a background gauge field for a symmetry group G involving some transformation of space itself. More generally, we believe a framework exists where one can also consider symmetries that transform space-*time*. However, for simplicity and to maintain contact with Hamiltonian models we will focus on purely spatial symmetries. We call such an object a crystalline gauge field.

A special case of a background gauge field is an isolated *gauge flux*. Isolated gauge fluxes are familiar objects for *internal* symmetries. They are objects in space of codimension 1 (i.e. points in 2-D, curves in 3-D) which are labelled by a group element $g \in G$, and a particle moving all the away around one is acted upon by g. Actually, for a non-Abelian group only the conjugacy class of g is gauge-invariant.

Gauge fluxes for spatial symmetries are also labelled by conjugacy classes of G. They are also well-known, but not under that name; they are more commonly referred to as *crystal defects*. For example, a gauge flux for translational symmetry is a *dislocation* and a gauge flux for a rotational symmetry is a *disclination* (Fig 1). In 3d, the direction of dislocation does not have to be in the plane perpendicular to the defect, as in a screw dislocation. A defect for reflection symmetry is like the Möbius band (a cross cap). For a glide reflection we also insert a shift in the lattice as we go around the band. We will see how this zoo of defect configurations is tamed by topology.

Generalizing these examples, we can give a systematic definition of crystalline gauge flux,



FIG. 1. An angular defect of 90 degrees in a vertex-centered square lattice and an angular excess of 120 degrees in a face-centered kagome lattice.

and more generally of a crystalline gauge field. For motivation, one can look again at Fig 1. The original lattice Λ is an ordinary square lattice. The crucial property of the defect is that away from the singular point in the middle, the defective lattice Σ is *locally* isomorphic to Λ, but there is no *global* map from Σ to Λ. Indeed, if we start somewhere $m \in \Sigma$ in the defect lattice away from the singular point and start mapping into $\hat{f}(m) = x \in \Lambda$ in the original lattice, going around we find our way back to m but in the wrong part of the original lattice. We find ourselves rotated 90 degrees from where we originally decided to map m! See Fig 2. On the other hand, because the ill-definedness always comes down to an argument between $\hat{f}(m) = x$ and $\hat{f}(m) = g(x)$ (in this case g is a 90 degree rotation), there is a map onto the quotient lattice Λ/G. We capture this idea in the following definition.

Instead of the lattice itself, we will express our definitions in terms of the ambient spatial manifolds in which they are embedded. Thus, we will denote by X the ambient space in which the original lattice Λ (without defects) is embedded; usually we will want to take $X = \mathbb{R}^d$. We assume there is an action of G on X which leaves the lattice Λ, as well as the Hamiltonian H acting on Λ, invariant. The lattice with defects will be embedded in a different space M. We don't include the defect locations themselves in M; for example, in



FIG. 2. A 90 degree disclination maps discontinuously to the square lattice, as indicated with the colored quadrants. The red line is the branch cut across which the image rotates by 90 degrees. Because the discontinuity is by a rotation in G, this map descends to a continuous map from the disclination to the quotient of the square lattice by G.

the disclination example, M is the plane minus the origin.[2]

Definition 1. A *G-twisted partial covering of M* $\dashrightarrow X$ is a continuous map $f : M \to X/G$ which *locally* lifts to a homeomorphism $\hat{f} : M \to X$.

We return to what locally lifts means in a moment.

Given any G-twisted partial covering $f : M \dashrightarrow X$ and a lattice Λ in X which is invariant under the action of G, we can define a "pulled-back" lattice $f^*\Lambda$. Indeed, in a local neighborhood $U \subseteq M$ we have a homeomorphism φ into X, so we just define the lattice on U to be the pre-image of Λ under this homeomorphism. We have to assume U is large enough to contain some cells of X in its image (we will take this to be implicit in the definition of G-twisted partial covering). For example, pulling-back the square lattice in $\mathbb{R}^2$ by $z \mapsto z^{4/3}$ gives the first lattice in Fig 1 while the second is the pullback of the kagome lattice by $z \mapsto z^{3/4}$. Similarly, given a G-invariant Hamiltonian H acting on degrees of freedom bound to the lattice Λ whose terms are supported within U, we can define the pull-back f^*H acting on degrees of freedom living on $f^*\Lambda$. We want to interpret this pulled-back Hamiltonian as the Hamiltonian describing the system coupled to a background crystalline gauge field. Unlike the case of internal symmetries, not just the Hamiltonian but even the geometry of the lattice it acts upon is dependent on this background.

[2] To include symmetries acting in the time direction, X and M may also denote spacetime manifolds.



FIG. 3. The square lattice after blowing up. This is achieved by separating all the plaquettes, doubling the number of bonds and quadrupling the number of sites (white circles). There are the same number of plaquettes however, and since the Hamiltonian terms live on the plaquettes (orange), they carry directly over to the blown-up lattice. To get equivalent physics we need also to add projection operators (green) which glue the lattice back together by imposing that the sites connected by the green bonds carry the same state.

We can be very concrete about this. First, we must make our lattice model a little more malleable. We do this by "blowing up" the lattice. This is shown in Fig 3[3]. This gives us an equivalent lattice system with the same crystalline symmetries. For this to work, the Hamiltonian has to be "ultralocal to the lattice", meaning that terms only couple sites which share a single plaquette[4]. This lets us depict the Hamiltonian by the orange squares as we have in Fig3. We describe the disclination by its image in $\mathbb{R}^2$, the colored quadrants of Fig 2, along with projection operators that glue the red curves together. These projection operators are shown by the blue bonds near the singularity in Fig 4 and are twisted by the symmetry operator. This choice of branch cut is the same as a choice of discontinuous lift $\hat{f} : M = (\mathbb{R}^2 - 0) \to \mathbb{R}^2 = X$. It is like a choice of gauge. The Hamiltonian depicted in Fig 4 we denote $\hat{f}^* H$ and represents the Hamiltonian in the background of the G-twisted covering $f : M \dashrightarrow X$ in the gauge $\hat{f}$.

Given the above considerations, we might want to define a *crystalline gauge field* as a G-twisted partial covering $M \dashrightarrow X$. Actually, it will prove convenient to include in the definition of a crystalline gauge field some data that explicitly characterize the G-ambiguity and the lifting procedure. This expanded definition will also be better behaved in cases where G includes internal symmetries which act trivially on X [for example, charge U(1)].

Definition 2. A *crystalline gauge field* is a pair (π, φ), where $\pi : P \to M$ is a principal G bundle, $\varphi : P \to X$ is a partial covering of X (i.e. an H-twisted partial covering with $H = 1$), satisfying $\varphi(gp) = g\varphi(p)$ for all $p \in P$. We say that two pairs (π, φ), (π', φ') represent the

[3] For geometers, essentially we are replacing the 1-skeleton of the lattice by its tubular neighborhood. This turns the cell structure into a handle-body decomposition. The vertices become discs (0-handles) and the edges become ribbons (1-handles).

[4] However, this is not a restriction for the more general characterization of the pull-back described in the previous paragraph.



FIG. 4. To insert a 90-degree disclination into the blown up square lattice, we must remove an entire quadrant. Then we insert projection operators along the blue bonds so that the upper states along the bonds differ from the lower ones by an application of the 90 degree clockwise rotation operator. To do this we need that the rotation operator splits as a tensor product site-to-site, which generalizes on-site symmetry action for spatial symmetries. We call such a symmetry action ultralocal. Note that the innermost blue bond is "missing". Because of the green bonds there, we would get only no states if we inserted a non-trivial projector there. The space between those two green bonds and the first blue bond is the hole in the disclination geometry where the singularity is. We can think of these blue bonds as a branch cut (red line in Fig 2). Note that away from the branch cut the Hamiltonian is no different from the blown up square lattice Hamiltonian.

same crystalline gauge field if the principal G-bundles $\pi : P \to M$ and $\pi' : P' \to M$ are isomorphic by a map $\sigma : P \to P'$ such that $\varphi' \circ \sigma = \varphi$. We call the principal G bundle $\pi : P \to M$ the *twisting* of the crystalline gauge field.

Observe that we can use π and φ to construct a map $f : M \to X/G$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & X \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \downarrow \\ M & \xrightarrow{f} & X/G \end{array} . \tag{1.1}$$

Moreover, since (by the definition of bundle), π is locally invertible, we see that f can be locally lifted to a homeomorphism into X; that is, f is a G-twisted partial covering $M \dashrightarrow X$. The non-trivial holonomies of π precisely encode the G-obstruction to extending this local lift globally.

For now, we illustrate this diagram for the 90 degree angular defect. We can parametrize $M = \mathbb{R}^2 - 0$ with an angular coordinate $\zeta \in [0, 3\pi/2)$. This indicates that the fourth quadrant is missing, as in Fig 1. The map to $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, parametrized by angular coordinate $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, is $\theta = \zeta$. This map is not well defined because $3\pi/2$ and 0 get mapped to different θ, though they are the same ζ. However, we do get a well-defined map f to X/G, parametrized by $\bar{\theta} \in [0, \pi/2)$: $\bar{\theta} = \zeta$. The difference here is $3\pi/2 \sim 0$ in X/G. Now, we can



FIG. 5. Here we depict the principal G-bundle π as a collection of branch cuts labelled by G (black arrows). These run transverse to the lattice, through the interstitial spaces made after blowing up. They are required to be conserved, so the only divergences are at the singular point (star at center). Recall from Fig 3 that the colored bonds represent projectors which set the states at the sites connected by bonds to be equal. When the black arrow labelled by $g \in G$ crosses a projector, we twist the projector so that it sets the state at the site to the "inside" (using a co-orientation) of the branch cut equal to the operator g applied to the state at the site on the "outside" of the branch cut which shares the bond with the inside site. In this figure, the blue bonds correspond to a $g \in G$ which maps to a clockwise rotation symmetry by 90 degrees, the yellow bonds to an internal symmetry $g \in G$ which acts trivially on X. A gauge transformation simply moves these branch cuts around. An example is shown in Fig 6.

take P to be the 4-fold cover of M, parametrized by $\hat{\zeta} \in [0, 6\pi)$. We make φ send $\theta = \zeta$ and we get a well-defined map since $0 \sim 2\pi$ in X. Further, one checks that the square commutes. Indeed, we can summarize by the range of the angular variables:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 6\pi & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & 2\pi \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \downarrow \\ 3\pi/2 & \xrightarrow{f} & \pi/2 \end{array}, \tag{1.2}$$

where the horizontal maps don't affect the angular coordinate (but have degree 3) and the vertical maps are division by 4. The formulation of the angular excess in the kagome lattice is left as an exercise to the reader.

Let us give another, more concrete version of the definition. If we have a cell decomposition of M, then a crystalline gauge field starts with an assignment of group elements $\in G$ to (co-oriented) codimension 1 facets. (We can think of these facets carrying non-trivial group elements as "branch cuts"). These represent the twisting π of the crystalline gauge field in Eq. (2). They satisfy a flatness rule that if we start in one cell and traverse a contractible loop, writing down the group elements we go, either g_ν or g_ν^{-1} depending on whether we traverse the facet ν along or against the co-orientation, then the expression we complete at



FIG. 6. Here we give another picture of the Hamiltonian in the background of a disclination but in a jagged choice gauge $\hat{f}$ obtained by moving the rotation branch cut of Fig 5 over one plaquette on the top edge.

the end of our loop computes the identity element of G. The map φ in Eq. (2) is represented by an assignment of embedding $f_\tau : \tau \to X$ for every volume (top dimensional cell) τ such that if two volumes τ, τ' meet along a facet $(\nu : \tau \to \tau', g_\nu)$ then there is a twisted gluing condition $f_\tau|_\nu = g f_{\tau'}|_\nu$, where $g f_{\tau'}(x) = f_{\tau'}(g(x))$. A gauge transformation is parametrized by a group element h_τ for each volume τ, and takes the form $f_\tau \to h_\tau f_\tau$, $g_\nu \to h_{\tau_1}^{-1} g_\nu h_{\tau_2}$, where $\tau_{1,2}$ are the volumes bordering ν, ordered according to the orientation of ν. When the maps f_τ map the lattice in M into the lattice in X (which we can always enforce when the "partial covering" condition in Definition 2 is satisfied) then one can pull back ultralocal lattice Hamiltonians along them in a manner we have described in Fig 5. See also Appendix B.

Let us remark on a subtlety in the definition of crystalline gauge field: in the case that the whole symmetry group acts internally, we might expect the definition to reduce to just a principal G-bundle, which corresponds to the usual definition of gauge field in that case. Instead, the definition reduces to a principal G-bundle plus a partial covering $M \to X$. In the next section we discuss possible dependence on this extra piece of data.

B. Topological crystalline liquids

In this section, we will introduce the notion of a *topological crystalline liquid*. To motivate the definition, we observe that in a topological phase we normally expect the long-range, low-energy physics to be sensitive only to the topology of the manifold in which the system is embedded and not the microscopic details of the lattice. We call such a phase of matter a "topological liquid"[63]. This is a non-trivial assumption. There are in fact exotic "fracton" topological phases which are not topological liquids. A simple example would be a stack of toric codes in three dimensions. The ground-state degeneracy depends on the number of layers, which is not a homotopy invariant of the 3-torus, so this is not a topological liquid. However, we will not consider such phases for the moment.



FIG. 7. The pullback of the face-centered square lattice by the map $f_2(z) = z^2$ gives another "square" lattice in the punctured plane. Is the IR physics on this lattice distinguished from the usual square lattice on the punctured plane? Indistinguishability is a feature of a topological crystalline liquid.

At first it might seem that the concept of "topological liquid" is not really applicable for phases protected by spatial symmetries, for which the microscopic structure of the lattice seems to play an essential role. Therefore, we will first consider the case of a system without symmetries, $G = 1$.

The definition of crystalline gauge field discussed above reduces to something non-trivial even in the no-symmetry case: a local homeomorphism $M \to X$. There are distinct classes of such maps even when X is contractible. For example, let $X = \mathbb{C}$, $M = \mathbb{C} - 0$, and consider the maps $f_1(z) = z$ and $g_2(z) = z^2$. Pulling back the square lattice by f_1 of course results in an ordinary square lattice. Pulling back a square lattice under f_2 is shown in Fig 7. Note the singular face is an octagon. These configurations are not equivalent in a "rigid" sense. The corresponding maps cannot be continuously deformed to each other in the space of local homeomorphisms. On the other hand, for a topological liquid the global topological features of these two systems should be identical, because the spaces they live in have the same topology; they differ only in the microscopic configuration of the lattice.

A topological crystalline liquid is the generalization of this notion to the case $G \neq 1$. Phases with space-group symmetries are distinguished by their topological response to coupling to a crystalline gauge field. But a topological crystalline liquid still maintains a certain amount of "fluidity" which ensures that the long-range response is sensitive only to the equivalence class of the background crystalline gauge field under certain singular transformations. For example, the maps $f_1(z)$ and $f_2(z)$ discussed above can be continuously connected *if* we drop the requirement that the local homeomorphism condition be satisfied throughout; we

say that they are homotopic maps from $M \to X$. In fact, f_1 and f_2 are both homotopic to the constant map $f_{\text{const}}(z) = 0$.

More generally, we should think of the definition of crystalline gauge field given in the previous section as the "rigid" version of a crystalline gauge field. We generalize this to "collapsible" crystalline gauge fields as follows. First we generalize G-twisted partial coverings to G-twisted maps:

Definition 3. A *G-twisted map of $M \dashrightarrow X$* is a continuous map $f : M \to X/G$ which *locally* lifts to a continuous map into X.

The difference with a G-twisted partial covering as defined above is that we do not require the local lift to be a homeomorphism. The corresponding enlarged definition of "crystalline gauge field" is

Definition 4. A *collapsible crystalline gauge field* is a pair (π, φ) as in Definition 2, except that φ only has to be a continuous map from $P \to X$, not a partial covering.

Equivalently, we can work in terms of the more concrete cellular, where for a collapsible crystalline gauge field, the f_τ are only required to be continuous maps into X, not embeddings.

We will define the "collapsible homotopy class" of crystalline gauge fields to be an equivalence class under continuous deformations in the space of collapsible crystalline gauge fields. There are very concrete ways to compute these gauge equivalence classes. See Thm 3. For $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, we give a concrete characterization of collapsible homotopy classes in the next section. With these definitions in hand, we can give the definition

Definition 5. A topological crystalline phase is a *topological crystalline liquid (TCL)* if the long-range response of the system to crystalline gauge fields is sensitive only to its collapsible homotopy class.

Let us be a bit more precise about what we mean by "long-range response". Recall that, given a manifold M and a (rigid) crystalline gauge field A, we can pull-back a Hamiltonian $H_{M,A}$. We denote the low-energy Hilbert space of $H_{M,A}$ by $\mathcal{H}_{M,A}$. The precise formulation of the "topological crystalline liquid" assumption is that there is a *canonical* choice of local unitary map $U_{A',A}$ which relates the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{M,A}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{M,A'}$ for any crystalline gauge fields A and A' in the same collapsible homotopy class. "Canonical" means that for any sequence (A_1, A_2, A_3) of crystalline gauge fields in the same collapsible homotopy class,

$$U_{A_3,A_2} U_{A_2,A_1} P_{A_1} = U_{A_3,A_1} P_{A_1}, \tag{1.3}$$

where P_{A_1} is the projector onto $\mathcal{H}_{M,A_1}$. This allows us to introduce a notion of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{M,[A]}$ associated with a collapsible homotopy class $[A]$. For example, we can simply define $\mathcal{H}_{M,[A]} = \mathcal{H}_{M,A}$ for some choice of representative A. It doesn't matter *which* A we choose because $U_{A',A}$ gives us a canonical way to relate different choices of representatives.

We can think of the choice of representative as simply a kind of "gauge choice" and the U_{A_i,A_j} as defining a trivial connection on a bundle of Hilbert spaces living over the space of gauge fields.

We want to consider topological crystalline liquids because they are a natural generalization of topological liquids to systems with crystalline symmetries. Moreover, in Section I C we give a "bootstrap" construction of a large class of phases which are explicitly shown to be topological crystalline liquids. More generally, we will boldly state the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1. *If a topological crystalline phase becomes a topological liquid when the crystalline symmetries are relaxed, then it is a TCL.*

We will return to this issue in Section IV C, where we give an argument for this conjecture in terms of local topological quantum field theories. Local TQFTs are believed to describe all topological phases with gappable boundaries. We define what it means for the IR limit (of the ungauged system), as described by a local TQFT, to depend spatially on X, reflecting the structure of the crystal, and show via the cobordism hypothesis of Baez-Dolan-Lurie that if the crystalline symmetry acts in a compatible way, this defines a TCL upon gauging.

We observe that *chiral phases* (more generally, those not supporting a gapped edge), are not known to admit descriptions in terms of local TQFTs. However, we note that the bootstrap construction described below can be used to generate TCLs with ungappable edges, so we would expect that Conjecture 1 holds for such phases also.

C. Bootstrap construction of topological crystalline liquids

Here we will discuss how to explicitly construct phases of matter which satisfy the TCL criterion. First of all, we note that the property of being a TCL is an invariant of a topological crystalline phase of matter: if it is true for one point in the phase, then it is true for all points in the phase.

To see this, let $H(s)$ be a continuous gapped path of Hamiltonians preserving the relevant symmetries. We want to argue that if $H = H(0)$ defines a TCL then so does $H' = H(1)$. We observe that we can pull-back the path $H(s)$ by a crystalline gauge field A giving a gapped path[5] $\{H(s)\}_A$. We know [64–66] that this gives a local unitary V_A relating the ground-state subspace of $\{H\}_A$ and $\{H'\}_A$. On the other hand, by definition since H defines a TCL there is a canonical choice of local unitary U_{A_2,A_1} relating the ground-state subspaces of $\{H\}_{A_2}$ and $\{H\}_{A_1}$ for two crystalline gauge fields A_2 and A_1 in the same collapsible homotopy class. Therefore, we can define the unitary U'_{A_2,A_1} relating the ground-state subspaces of $\{H'\}_{A_1}$ and $\{H\}_{A_2}$ according to

$$U'_{A_2,A_1} = V_{A_2} U_{A_2,A_1} V_{A_1}^\dagger. \tag{1.4}$$

It is easily seen that this satisfies Eq. (1.3), so we conclude that H' indeed defines a TCL.

[5] One might wonder whether $\{H(s)\}_A$ is necessarily gapped even if $H(s)$ is. However, we expect that the gappedness should be detectible locally, and locally $\{H(s)\}_A$ looks the same as $H(s)$.

Now we will construct a TCL explicitly. (A similar "bootstrap" construction was used by one of us to construct phases of matter protected by time-translation symmetry in Ref. 62). For simplicity we consider the case where the entire symmetry group G acts spatially, i.e. the internal subgroup is trivial. first of all, let φ be a surjective homomorphism from the symmetry group G to a finite group G_f. We use one of many approaches to construct a topological liquid with an *internal* symmetry G_f. In most of these approaches, there is no obstacle to construct the Hamiltonian to *also* have a spatial symmetry G, which commutes with G_f so that the full symmetry group is $\widetilde{G} = G \times G_f$. A crystalline gauge field for the full symmetry group is a pair (α_G, α_{G_f}), where α_G is a crystalline gauge field for G, and α_{G_f} is a G_f-connection. For a topological liquid, we can deform the lattice at will without changing the topological response, and so the phase should not have any non-trivial response to α_G at all. This is a (trivial) example of a TCL.

But now we can imagine deforming Hamiltonian to break the full symmetry group G down to the *diagonal subgroup*

$$G' = \{(g, \varphi(g)) \in \widetilde{G}\} \cong G. \tag{1.5}$$

Then we still have a TCL by the arguments given in the first paragraph, but now it has a non-trivial response to background crystalline gauge fields for G', inherited from the response to gauge fields for the internal symmetry G_f. This gives us a *non-trivial* TCL.

D. The Crystalline Equivalence Principle

Most of the time, we will be interested in topological crystalline phases in Euclidean space $X = \mathbb{R}^d$. In this case there is a very simple characterization of the collapsible homotopy classes of crystalline gauge fields:

Theorem 1. *If X is contractible, then the collapsible homotopy classes of crystalline gauge fields are in one-to-one correspondence with principal G-bundles.*

That is, the collapsible homotopy classes remember only the twisting (which we recall is a principal G-bundle), and not the rest of the data. This theorem is a corollary of the more general classification theorem for crystalline gauge fields. See Thm 3. However, here we remark on an elementary way to see one part of Thm 1: namely, that collapsible homotopy classes can only depend on the twisting. (For the moment we will not attempt to prove the other part, namely that *any* principal G-bundle gives rise to a collapsible homotopy class.) Although the proposition holds more generally, for simplicity we consider the case where $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and where the G action on X is affine linear:

$$gx = A_g x + b_g, \tag{1.6}$$

where A_g is a $(d \times d)$ matrix and b_g is a length d vector. We then observe that given a principal G-bundle $\pi : P \to M$, and two maps $\varphi_0 : M \to X$ and $\varphi_1 : M \to X$ such that

(π, φ_0) and (π, φ_1) are collapsible crystalline gauge fields, then (π, φ_s) is also a collapsible crytalline gauge field for $s \in [0, 1]$, where $\varphi_s = (1 - s)\varphi_0 + s\varphi_1$. [The only thing to check is that φ_s satisfies $g\varphi_s(p) = \varphi_s(gp)$, which follows from Eq. (1.6).]

Thm 1 allows us to deduce the most important result of this paper. Thm 1 shows that collapsible homotopy classes of crystalline gauge fields are in one-to-one correspondence with principle G-bundles. On the other hand, homotopy classes of gauge fields for an *internal* symmetry also correspond to principal G-bundles. Topological phases are distinguished by their response to background gauge fields. Therefore we conclude the

Crystalline Equivalence Principle: The classification of topological crystalline liquids on a contractible space with spatial symmetry group G is the *same* as the classification of topological phases with *internal* symmetry G.

To make the equivalence work, orientation-reversing symmetries in the space group must correspond to anti-unitary symmetries in the internal group. We will discuss this correspondence in detail in the next section when we discuss possible topological response of a TCL in a non-trivial crystalline gauge background.

E. Beyond Euclidean space

Before we delve into the details of how to classify topological crystalline liquids by their topological response to gauge fields, we recall that the above considerations related to topological phases that exist in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. However, in principle one can consider the more exotic problem of classifying topological phases on non-contractible spaces; for example, the d-sphere, the d-torus, or a Euclidean space with holes[6]. The physical relevance of this problem may be a bit obscure, but from a theoretical point of view we find it more enlightening to formulate the problem we are interested in – Euclidean space – as a special case of the more general problem. It also illustrates an important conceptual point, because, as we shall see, the Crystalline Equivalence Principle does *not* hold on non-contractible spaces. Thus, the Crystalline Equivalence Principle is not something that *a priori* had to be true; rather, it is a consequence of the fact that systems of physical interest live in Euclidean space.

On contractible spaces, we had a classification theorem 1 for crystalline gauge fields. This classification theorem is a special case of the more general result (see Appendix B and Theorem 3) that collapsible homotopy classes of crystalline gauge fields $M \dashrightarrow X$ are classified by homotopy classes of maps from M into the "homotopy quotient" $X//G$. For X contractible, $X//G$ is homotopic to the "classifying space" BG, so we recover Theorem

[6] We emphasize that, in the absence of translational symmetry, it does not make sense to relate a topological phase defined on one compact space to one defined on another space with different topology. That is, the classification can depend on the background space.

1 if we invoke the well-known fact that homotopy classes of G-connections are classified by homotopy classes of maps $M \to BG$.

Finally, let us remark on a technical point: the definition of "topological crystalline liquid" must be slightly amended for non-contractible X. That is, in general we should allow the unitary $U^{\gamma}_{A_1,A_2}$ relating the low-energy Hilbert spaces corresponding to two crystalline gauge fields A_1 and A_2 in the same collapsible homotopy class to depend on the path γ relating A_1 and A_2. We no longer impose Eq. (1.4) but just require that $U^{\gamma}_{A_1,A_2}$ be invariant under continuous deformations of the path γ.

II. TOPOLOGICAL RESPONSE AND CLASSIFICATION

In this section, we will discuss how our understanding of what it means to gauge a spatial symmetry allows us to classify topological phases by their topological responses. Basically, any approach to understanding topological phases with *internal* symmetries which relies on gauging the symmetry, can be applied equally well to space-group symmetries by coupling to crystalline gauge fields. Moreover, in Euclidean space, Theorem 3 should imply that we obtain the same classification as for internal symmetries, in accordance with the Crystalline Equivalence Principle. In non-contractible spaces we may obtain a different classification.

There are two main approaches to thinking about topological response. The first is a bottom-up approach where one starts with a Hamiltonian in a lattice model and one attempts to work out all the topological excitations. For example in 2+1D, one has anyons and symmetry fluxes and one can ask about how they interact. This is tabulated mathematically in a G-crossed braided fusion category and one can try to work out a classification of these objects or at least find some interesting examples and then look for lattice realizations.

The second approach is a top-down one where one first assumes the existence of an IR limit of the gapped system. This is a topological quantum field theory (TQFT) of some sort and one can just try to guess what it is from the microscopic symmetries, entanglement structure (short-range vs. long-range), and so on. One can make a bold statement that all possible IR limits are of a certain type of TQFT and then try to classify all of those. Despite its obvious lack of rigor, this approach has proven successful.

One reason for this is that it is often possible to bridge the two perspectives. For example, a G-SPT can be understood in terms of an effective action $\omega \in H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z})$[17, 57] leading ultimately to a TQFT. But considering the fusion of symmetry fluxes also leads to an element of $\mathcal{H}^D(G, U(1))$ through a higher associator of symmetry fluxes (in $2+1$-D, it is the F symbol). These are equivalent under the isomorphism $H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathcal{H}^D(G, U(1))$ (see Appendix C for more explanation of this isomorphism). In general, defects such as anyons and symmetry fluxes can be described in the TQFT framework through the language of "extended TQFT".

Let us now discuss how these methods can be extended to the case of spatial symmetries.

A. Flux fusion and braiding for SET phases in (2+1)-D with spatial symmetry

If we want to classify symmetry-enriched phases in (2+1)-D phases we can consider the "bottom-up" approach of Ref. 7. There, one has a topological phase with an internal symmetry G, and one envisages coupling to a classical background gauge field. In particular, one can consider gauge-field configurations in which the gauge fluxes are localized to a discrete set of points. One can then consider the algebraic structure of braiding and fusion of such gauge fluxes, which is an extension of the braiding and fusion of the intrinsic excitations (anyons) that exist without symmetry. This structure is argued to be described by a mathematical object called a "G-crossed braided tensor category". For a topological crystalline liquid on Euclidean space, we expect that the equivalence between crystalline gauge fields and G-connections allows the arguments to carry over without significant change. (We will leave a detailed derivation for future work.)

On non-contractible spaces, presumably a generalization of the arguments of Ref. 7 should be possible, but we will not explore this.

B. Topological actions

Just like with internal symmetries, we can use cohomology to classify invertible crystalline topological phases. This approach makes no distinction between time and space coordinates and so for the rest of the section we may replace X and M with spacetime manifolds. We are motivated by direct analogy with Refs 17 and 57. Let us review how one derives the ordinary group cohomology classification of internal SPTs in this framework. A cohomology class $\omega \in H^D(BG, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$[7] defines a G-equivariant TQFT in D spacetime dimensions via the effective action

$$2\pi i \int_X A^* \omega,$$

where the background gauge field A is realized as a map $X \to BG$. By a construction in Ref 17 all of these topological responses are actually realized in lattice systems, though they are far from all of them[22].

For our crystalline gauge fields we again have a classifying space $X//G$, called the homotopy quotient of X by G and pronounced "X mod mod G". What this means is that a crystalline gauge field $M \dashrightarrow X$ is the same data as an ordinary map $A : M \to X//G$. This is discussed in Appendix B and is the content of Thm 3. Using the homotopy quotient we can write down topological responses in a similar way. Indeed, with a cohomology class $\omega \in H^D(X//G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$[8] and a crystalline gauge field $A : M \to X//G$ we can write the topological response

$$2\pi i \int_M A^* \omega.$$

[7] Actually we should use only measurable cohomology or use different coefficients in a different degree: $H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z})$. We discuss this subtlety in Appendix C.

[8] Same caveats about coefficients here too.

Note that the topological response is an integral over M, not X. This integral is defined in the Appendix D. This cohomology group is actually well-known in algebraic topology; it goes by the name of "equivariant cohomology" and is often written $H^D_G(X, U(1))$.

Actually we need to be a little careful with coefficients. We intend to integrate $A^*\omega$ over M, the proper domain of the crystalline gauge field, but if G contains orientation-reversing elements like mirror and glide reflections (or time reversal), then M may likely be unorientable. To fix this, we need to use *twisted* equivariant cohomology, with G acting on the coefficient group $U(1) = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, trivially for orientation preserving symmetries, and by $\theta \mapsto -\theta$ for orientation-reversing symmetries. We call this coefficient group $U(1)^{or}$ and the integer one $\mathbb{Z}^{or}$. The "or" designates that the twisting line is the orientation line $\mathbb{R}^{or}$, where volume forms live, which is a trivial line on X but which gets flipped under an orientation-reversing element of G.

For example, take M as the Möbius band, $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ and G equal to wallpaper group *pg* with its two glide reflections. Then X/G is a Klein bottle and $M \to X/G$ may wrap the orientation-reversing cycle. This map $M \to X/G$ does not lift to X or any other orientable cover of X/G, but we may double cover M by the orientable band $P = \mathbb{R}^2 - 0$ to lift this map.

Another subtlety comes from considering the identity map $X \to X$ as a G-twisted partial cover. Any non-trivial topological response to the identity cover is equivalent to a shift of all the partition functions by a phase. We may as well consider only the cohomology classes which pulled back along the identity map are trivial. This is called reduced cohomology and is denoted with a tilde $\tilde{H}$.

With these caveats in hand we obtain

Theorem 2. *Homotopy-invariant effective actions in $D = d + 1$ spacetime dimensions for crystalline gauge fields $A : M \to X//G$ which may be written as integrals over M are in correspondence with twisted reduced equivariant cohomology*

$$\tilde{H}^{D+1}_G(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}).$$

Even though these are all the effective actions, from what we've learned in the case with time reversal symmetry[22] and consideration of thermal Hall response, we know these are very unlikely to be all the phases. There are some criteria, like homotopy invariance, that pick out these phases based on their effective action, but we don't know a microscopic characterization of which phases come from group cohomology and which phases are from the beyond. We say "bosonic" because we have learned the importance of including spin structure in a careful way [28]. We discuss the relationship between topological actions and phases in Appendix C.

C. TQFT picture

The most general (but also most abstract) way to think about the classification is in terms of TQFTs. If we have a system with an internal symmetry G, then one can imagine coupling it to a background gauge field (which we treat as a fixed classical probe) and considering the resulting low-energy theory. A reasonable conjecture is that this low-energy theory is described by a TQFT. Specifically, it is a TQFT for manifolds decorated by the background gauge field. One way to describe this is using the language of "homotopy TQFT", as a homotopy TQFT for manifolds over BG. The naturally leads us to conjecture in the case of spatial symmetries acting on a space X that

Conjecture 2. *The IR limit of a topological crystalline liquid coupled to a background crystalline gauge field $M \dashrightarrow X$ for a spatial symmetry group G can be considered as a TQFT for manifolds over $X//G$.*

Indeed, one could take this as a more precise *definition* of what it means to be a topological crystalline liquid. We will have more to say about Conj 2 from the perspective of the cobordism hypothesis later, in Section IV C.

III. EXPLORING THE EQUIVARIANT COHOMOLOGY CLASSIFICATION

Let us explore further the properties of the equivariant cohomology classification we obtained from the topological action approach in Section II B.

A. General properties of the classification

All of the following are derived from properties of the homotopy quotient $X//G$ discussed in Appendix B. In these X refers to the spacetime manifold of dimension $D = d + 1$.

- **Crystalline Equivalence Principle** If $X = \mathbb{R}^D$, then $H_G^{D+1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{Z}^{or}) = H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^{or})$. For orientation-preserving symmetries, we find an isomorphic classification with those phases protected by an internal unitary symmetry [17]. For orientation-reversing symmetries, we find for example that inversion-symmetric SPT phases have the same classification as time-reversal-symmetric SPT phases.

- **Rolling and Unrolling** If G contains a normal subgroup H which acts freely on X, then we can quotient X by H and obtain an equivalent rolled up phase: $H_G^{D+1}(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H_{G/H}^{D+1}(X/H, \mathbb{Z}^{or})$. We can also unroll a phase along any circular coordinates to get an equivalent phase with a translation symmetry in the unrolled direction, so these classifications are isomorphic. In particular, if G is the space group of a crystal, then the translations are a normal subgroup which act freely and we may instead study the point group acting on the quotient torus. This works even

for non-symmorphic symmetries, as observed in Ref 67: even if there is no symmetry center, the point group will act on the fundamental torus. However, this residual group G/H can still contain things like glide reflections (and certainly will if we are in a non-symmorphic situation).

- **No Translation SPTs** If G acts freely on X, eg. translations on $\mathbb{R}^d$, then by rolling up along all the translations we get an equivalent phase on a torus without any symmetries: $H_G^{D+1}(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}) = H^{D+1}(X/G, \mathbb{Z}^{or})$. In particular, since X/G is a manifold, the reduced cohomology in the top degree is always zero, so there are no non-trivial phases.

- **New Internal SPTs Protected by Topology** On the other hand, if G is an internal symmetry, meaning it doesn't act on X, then $X//G = X \times BG$. This means $H_G^{D+1}(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}) = \bigoplus_{j+k=D+1} H^j(BG, H^k(X, \mathbb{Z}))$. If we require that ω has no dependence on X, we find the usual group cohomology classification for internal symmetry SPTs[17]. We see however the possibility for new equivariant cohomology SPT phases which are protected by the topology of X as well as G symmetry. These all look like lower dimensional G SPT phases wrapped perpendicular to non-contractible cycles of X. We will return to this possibility in examples below.

- **Finitely Many Phases in Each Symmetry Class** (X, G) In fact, all phases originate in some element of $E_2 = \oplus_{j+k=D+1} H^j(BG, H^k(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}))$. How this works is the content of the descent sequence we discuss in Appendix D. Because we can roll up our phases to equivalent ones with finite symmetry G, the only piece of E_2 which can contribute infinite order elements is the $j = 0$ piece $H^0(BG, H^{D+1}(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}))$. Happily, since X is D-dimensional, this piece always vanishes, so E_2 is finite and therefore there are only finitely many phases in each symmetry class (X, G).

- **Rolling in the Time Domain** The classification does not distinguish between spatial and temporal components of X. If we have a time translation symmetry $\mathbb{Z}_t$ as in a Floquet system [62, 68–74], then we may roll up the time direction into a circle with circumference equal the time step. For Floquet systems on spacetime $\mathbb{R}^D$ with internal symmetry G we rederive the classification of Refs. 62, 69–71, $H^{D+2}(BG, H^0(S^1, \mathbb{Z})) \oplus H^{D+1}(BG, H^1(S^1, \mathbb{Z}))$.

B. Examples

We will discuss some examples corresponding to phases beyond the Crystalline Equivalence Principle. The group in the heading of each section denotes which part of the descent sequence the phase originates in. All the equivalent internal symmetry phases come from $H^{D+1}(BG, H^0(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or})) = H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^{or})$.

1. $H^2(BG, H^d(X, \mathbb{Z}^{or}))$ and wrapping SPTs on cycles

The first phase beyond the familiar group cohomology SPTs we notice is in 1+1D on $X = S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_t$, with internal symmetry G, is coming from $H^2(BG, H^1(X)) = H^2(BG, \mathbb{Z})$. For finite groups, this is the same as $H^1(BG, U(1))$, the group of abelian G-charges. We interpret this as meaning there the ground state on the circle carries a G-charge. Indeed, this charge cannot be changed without closing the gap. (On the real line, on the other hand, the total charge of the system is not well-defined, so there is no corresponding invariant.)

Recall that we can get to this phase starting with $X = \mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_t$ and a translation symmetry $x \mapsto x + 1$ combining to a total symmetry group $\mathbb{Z} \times G$. Then we can take the quotient by the translation symmetry $\theta = 2\pi x \mod 2\pi$ to obtain this phase on a circle. For finite G we can write the cohomology group as $H^1(BG, H^1(B\mathbb{Z}, U(1))$. By the usual interpretation of decorated domain wall cohomology groups[75] we conclude that in the unrolled phase the translation "domain walls" have a G charge q. A unit translation domain wall is just a collapsed unit cell, so we learn that each unit cell contains G charge q.[9] This is consistent with our interpretation of the quotient phase on the circle.

We can also obtain a phase thinking about a connected Lie group G. Then $H^2(BG, \mathbb{Z})$ is also classified by abelian representations of G. It can be interpreted as a charge trapped on a circle or a charge per unit cell, as above.

The topological invariant for $H^1(BG, H^1(S^1, \mathbb{Z}))$ is $\alpha d\theta/4\pi$, where α is the G gauge field and $d\theta/2\pi$ integrates to 1 on S^1_θ. If we consider the rolled up system on $X = S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_t$, then we can detect this term with the G-twisted map $f : T^2_{\mu,\lambda} \to S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_t$ defined by $f : (\mu, \lambda) \mapsto (\mu, 0)$. Because G does not act on S^1, we don't need any branch cuts, the map is continuous. However, we can still specify a non-trivial twisting field and indeed we must to detect the phase. We choose the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ connection on T^2 which corresponds to the double cover around the λ direction. We can coordinatize the cover, which is also T^2, by two angular coordinates $\hat{\mu}, \hat{\lambda}$. The map $\pi(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\lambda}) = (\hat{\mu}, 2\hat{\lambda})$. Likewise our lift is $\varphi(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\lambda}) = (\hat{\mu}, 0)$. We summarize this below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^2_{\hat{\mu},\hat{\lambda}} & \xrightarrow{(\hat{\mu},0)} & S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_t \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\hat{\mu},2\hat{\lambda})} & & \downarrow \\ T^2_{\mu,\lambda} & \xrightarrow{(\mu,0)} & S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_t \end{array} . \tag{3.1}$$

If we pull back the form $\alpha d\theta/4\pi$ to $M = T^2_{\mu,\lambda}$ we must interpret α as the twisting field coresponding to the cover π. It has a non-trivial Wilson loop

$$e^{\pi i \int_\lambda \alpha} = -1.$$

[9] Strictly speaking, the charge in a unit cell is not well-defined, since the ground state does not need to be an eigenstate of the charge integrated over a single unit cell. However, "charge bound to a translation domain wall" is a sharply defined quantity.

We find therefore the topological response

$$Z(T^2, f, \pi) = \exp\left(2\pi i \int_{T^2_{\mu,\lambda}} \alpha d\theta/4\pi\right) = -1,$$

signalling a non-trivial phase.

To understand the unrolled phase by coupling to a crystalline gauge background, we will have to use branch cuts.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R}_y \times S^1_{\hat{\lambda}} & \xrightarrow{(y,0)} & \mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_t \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle (y,2\hat{\lambda})} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (x,t)} \\ T^2_{\mu,\lambda} & \xrightarrow{(\mu,0)} & S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_t \end{array} . \tag{3.2}$$

Note that the bottom map does not lift continuously to the plane. The twisting field has two non-trivial holonomies now. One is a translation-by-one valued holonomy around μ corresponding to the infinite cover $\mathbb{R}_y \to S^1_\mu$ and the other is an internal $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry valued holonomy around λ corresponding to the double cover $S^1_{\hat{\lambda}} \to S^1_\lambda$. Now we interpret the topological term $\alpha d\theta/4\pi$ as being made out of the internal $\mathbb{Z}_2$ part of the holonomy α and the translation part of the holonomy $d\theta/2\pi$. We again find the response $Z(T^2, f, \pi) = -1$.

There are generalizations of this phase to higher dimensional compact spaces. If $X = Y \times \mathbb{R}_t$ with Y compact and orientable then $H^d(X) = \mathbb{Z}$ and hence $H^2(BG, H^d(X)) = H^2(BG, \mathbb{Z})$ so we again find the possibility of an abelian charge "trapped" on X. The nontriviality of these phases is protected both by the symmetry G and by the topology of space. We can also unroll these phases in the case X is a torus, obtaining a picture of a phase on $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ protected by translation symmetries and G with an abelian G charge per unit cell.

2. Reflection Acting on a Circle and 1D Phases with Two Reflection Centers

Consider a system on a circle with a reflection symmetry $\theta \mapsto -\theta$. By arguments of Ref 55, there should be a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2$ classification corresponding to the residual $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charges at the two fixed points (see Figure 8). For our classification, these phases live in $\tilde{H}^2_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(S^1, U(1)^{or})$. The cohomology groups in the descent sequence which contribute are

$$H^2(B\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)^{or}) = \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad \text{represented by } \alpha^2,$$

$$H^1(B\mathbb{Z}_2, H^1(S^1)^{or}) = \mathbb{Z}_2, \quad \text{represented by } \alpha d\theta.$$

We will explain the representatives in a moment. The first has to do with a kind of projective reflection symmetry action, while the second has to do with the circle carrying non-trivial reflection charge. Let us investigate these classes by thinking about which (collapsible) crystalline gauge fields they couple to. The domain M of these gauge fields will have to



FIG. 8. A reflection acting on a circle. The reflection axis is shown in red and the fixed points are marked with blue circles. SPT phases of this symmetry set up are classified by a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge at each fixed point. There are more phases in this geometry than on a line with a single reflection center!

be non-orientable since we are dealing with orientation-reversing symmetries. The first crystalline gauge field is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{RP}^2 & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R} \end{array} , \tag{3.3}$$

where we write $\mathbb{RP}^1$ for the circle modulo reflection (topologically it is also a circle). The map π is the orientation double cover of $\mathbb{RP}^2$ while f and ϕ are constant maps to one of the two fixed points. The orientation double cover of $\mathbb{RP}^2$ is represented via its twisting α (recall the definition of crystalline gauge field) by the unique non-trivial class in $H^1(\mathbb{RP}, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. $\mathbb{RP}^2$ happens to have a property that is not possible for oriented surfaces:

$$\exp\left(\pi i \int_{\mathbb{RP}^2} \alpha^2\right) = -1.$$

We therefore interpret the class $\alpha^2 \in H^2(B\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)^{or})$ as a topological term made out of the twisting and verify its non-trivial response to a (collapsible) crystalline gauge field. The quantity $\int_\Sigma \alpha^2$ itself can be written on any closed surface Σ as

$$\int_\gamma \alpha,$$

where γ is Poincaré dual to α in Σ, ie. γ represents the branch cuts (or domain walls, if you prefer) of our G-twisted map. The above expression is exactly the statement that γ carries a unit α charge. One can think of this either as a symptom of projective symmetry action, as $\mathcal{H}^2(G, U(1)^{or})$ denotes twisted group extensions, or as a residual charge on the fixed point. Note that since S^2 is simply connected, the upper horizontal map (and hence the lower) has



FIG. 9. A twisted map from the Klein bottle to the circle. We draw the circle as the purple curve and attempt to collapse the Klein bottle onto it. However, because of the anti-sense identifications on the left and right (red arrows), this cannot be done consistently unless we quotient the circle by reflection about the horizontal axis. We can, however, introduce a branch cut, in dotted green, and then formulate a consistent collapse, indicated by the black arrows. The right-most part of the collapse wraps around to end up on the left. The dotted green curve is Poincaré dual to the twisting field α and the dotted blue curve is Poincaré dual to the pullback of the class $d\theta \in H^1(S^1, \mathbb{Z})$.

to equivariantly retract to a map to a fixed point, but since we may choose either fixed point, we find the same residual $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge on each one, barring any other non-trivial topological response.

There is one more, though. We can consider

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T^2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & S^1 \times \mathbb{R} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} & & \downarrow \\ K & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R} \end{array}, \tag{3.4}$$

where K is a Klein bottle. The map f is described in Fig 9. Again π is the orientation double cover. One of the circles of T^2 wraps the circle and the other is collapsed. Also depicted in Fig 9 is the Poincaré duals of α and $f^* d\theta$, where $d\theta$ is the generator of $H^1(\mathbb{RP}^1, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$. We see first of all that $\int_K \alpha^2 = 0$, so this collapsible crystalline gauge field does not respond to the topological term α^2 which $\mathbb{RP}^2$ responded to. On the other hand,

$$\exp(\pi i \int_K \alpha f^* d\theta) = -1,$$

so this crystalline gauge background does respond to the topological term $\alpha d\theta$. If α were a gauge field living on S^1 for an internal symmetry, this expression would indicate that the spatial slice carries charge, as we considered in the previous examples.

We note also that this phase can be unrolled to a phase with two reflection centers, one

at $x = 0$ and one at $x = 1$. We denote these reflections R_0 and R_1, respectively. We find that $R_1 R_0$ is a right translation by two units. Therefore these phases are equivalent to phases on the line protected by two reflection centers or equivalently a single reflection and a translation.

3. $H^3(BG, H^{D-2}(X))$ and Lieb-Schultz-Mattis

Let us discuss another class of examples beginning with non-simply connected 2+1D spacetimes, eg. the infinite cylinder $X = S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_t$. Since $H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$, we have classes in equivariant cobordism coming from $H^3(BG, \mathbb{Z})$. These correspond to G-SPT phases in 1+1D. If we write the corresponding topological response as $\omega_1(A)$, where A is the G gauge field, then the total response on X is

$$\int_X d\theta \; \omega_1(A).$$

This topological response may be obtained beginning with a product state on $S^1_\theta \times \mathbb{R}_x$ and then creating ω_1-type entanglement along the 1d slice $\theta = 0$. Consider cutting open the cylinder, restricting the system to $-1 \leq x \leq 1$. Then the two circles $x = -1$ and $x = 1$ each carry an edge state with a projective G charge. These edges clearly cannot be disordered by any symmetry-preserving perturbation.

Unrolling this state we find it is equivalent to a state on the plane with a translation symmetry along one direction, where the translation-compatible edge has one projective G representation per unit cell. If we consider $G = SO(3)$ and $\omega_1 \in H^3(BSO(3), \mathbb{Z})$ defined by the class of the projective spin 1/2 representation, then we obtain an edge with a half-integer spin per unit cell. The gaplessness of the ground state of the edge (if it preserves the symmetry) is the classic statement of the Lieb-Schultz-Mattis theorem.

There are higher dimensional generalizations of this state as well. They live in $H^3(BG, H^{D-2}(X))$, where X is the spacetime dimension. If X is of the form $Y^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_t$ with closed compact Y then $H^{D-2}(X) = \mathbb{Z}$ and we can insert a 1+1D SPT along any point of Y. For example, $X = T^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_x \times \mathbb{R}_t$ with a 1+1D SPT bound to the center of the $d-1$-torus T^{d-1}. This phase unrolls to one with a boundary having a projective G charge in every unit cell. With $G = SO(3)$ assuming the stability from the rigidity of the topological response, we obtain the higher dimensional versions of Lieb-Schultz-Mattis. If X is of the form $Y^d \times \mathbb{R}_t$ with closed compact Y, then $H^{D-2}(X) = \mathrm{Hom}(H_1(Y), \mathbb{Z})$ and we can consider threading 1+1D G SPT phases along noncontractible cycles of Y.

4. $H^4(BG, H^{D-3}(X))$, weak topological insulators, 3+1D QHE

By now the pattern must be clear, so we will just mention one can take a ground state of a 2+1D topological insulator, add a new circular dimension θ and let the ground state state

be a product state on all the new sites. Unrolling θ gives one of the "weakly topological" band insulators in 3+1D, protected by translation symmetry in the unrolled direction plus the internal symmetries $U(1) \times T$.

Since Chern-Simons terms are classified by $H^4(BG, \mathbb{Z})$[57], we also see the possibility for a quantum Hall state wrapped perpendicular to a circle. With a boundary the geometry of the system is a solid torus with a quantum Hall state on a disc cutting the core of the solid torus. The spatial boundary of such a system is a thin torus with a long direction (which is not bounded by the sample) and a small direction (which is bounded by the sample). One can imagine that boundary states can move only one way along the small direction but any way they wish along the long direction. Backscattering in the small direction is unable to break the chirality in the long direction and the phase is stable.

IV. GENERALIZATIONS

A. Floquet SPTs and gauged Floquet SPTs

The TQFTs defined by our topological actions do not have a preferred axis of time. In a sense there is no difference between a discrete space translation and a discrete time translation. This suggests that all of the crystalline topological phases we have discussed with a discrete spatial translation symmetry can be thought of as Floquet crystalline topological phases [62, 68–74] which appear in a driven system with time-periodic Hamiltonian $H(t)$, with $H(t+T) = H(t)$. We will not, however, attempt to explain how precisely one arrives at a topological action describing such a driven system, nor even what it actually means to "gauge" a discrete time-translation symmetry.

For example, in 1+1D the $H^3(BG \times \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}) = H^3(BG, \mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^2(BG, \mathbb{Z})$ phases can be interpreted as Floquet phases with internal G symmetry. For finite G, this is $H^2(BG, U(1)) \oplus H^1(BG, U(1))$ and agrees with the classification in Ref. 69. The first group represents bulk SPT order and the second group represents a charge being pumped each time step.

We mention that $H^2(BU(1), \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ and so there seems to be a topological response analogous to these charge pumping phases but with symmetry $U(1)$. Though it is possible to construct finely tuned models which do this, they all seem to transport some non-trivial quantum information, so we remain skeptical that they exist in real systems.

There are also phases that mix Floquet and crystalline symmetry, for example in 2+1D on $X = \mathbb{R}_{x,y} \times \mathbb{R}_t$ with a translation symmetry $x \mapsto x+1$ and a Floquet symmetry $t \mapsto t+1$ there is a phase in $H^2(BG, H^2(B\mathbb{Z} \times B\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})) = H^2(BG, \mathbb{Z})$. The interpretation is that the system pumps a G charge per unit cell per time step on the boundary. This can be rolled up into a Floquet system on a cylinder which pumps a G charge per time step to the boundary circle.

It is possible to also pump higher dimensional SPT phases to the boundary. In a sense this is because SPT phases are themselves generalized abelian charges. These phases live in $H^D(BG, H^1(B\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}))$, which is $H^{D-1}(BG, U(1))$ for finite G. For example, in 3+1D we are

talking about $H^4(BG,\mathbb{Z})$. For connected Lie groups G these classify Chern-Simons actions. These correspond to 3+1D phases which pump a G Chern-Simons theory to the boundary each time step. For $G = U(1)$ these are integer quantum Hall states.

We pause here to appreciate that if we can build a Floquet system which pumps (internal) G SPT phases to the boundary, then we can think about coupling to a *dynamical* G gauge field. Generically, this makes the G SPT phase no longer invertible. For example, a trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ SPT in 2+1D becomes the toric code, which is topologically ordered. This does not mean, however, that we pump any non-trivial degrees of freedom to the boundary every time step. Rather, we have a G gauge theory at the boundary and at each time step we pump a *topological term*. For example, the 3+1D Floquet phase with internal $\mathbb{Z}_2$ which pumps the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ group cohomology SPT to the boundary each time step has in the gauged picture a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge theory on the boundary which at one time step is a toric code and at the next is a double semion and then toric code again. It is as though half a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge is pumped *to the fluxes* and they become semions. If one models this with a Walker-Wang model, then the fluxes on the boundary are themselves the boundaries of strings that reach into the bulk. It is as though these strings are decorated with half (!) the non-trivial 1+1D $\mathbb{Z}_2$ Floquet SPT, something that pumps half a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge each time step.

B. Fermions and Beyond Cohomology

We can go beyond equivariant cohomology by considering equivariant cobordism. This is where the invariants discussed in Ref 76 live. The definition of the most general equivariant cobordism is delicate, but by the Crystalline Equivalence Principle, we can assume that fermion phases for spacetime symmetries are like fermion phases for internal symmetries. By what we've learned from Ref 28, the data we need to define spin cobordism is a homomorphism $w_1 : G \to \mathbb{Z}/2$ telling us which elements of G are orientation-reversing and a group extension $w_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2(G,\mathbb{Z})$ telling us how G is extended by fermion parity. Then there is a corresponding equivariant spin cobordism group $\Omega^d_{\text{spin}}(G, w_1, w_2)$. These two classes can be nicely encoded in a single G-representation ξ as was done in Ref 28. Then we write $\Omega^d_{\text{spin}}(G,\xi)$. These are equivariant cobordism invariants of d-manifolds X with a spin structure on $TX \oplus A^*\xi$, where A is the G gauge field. For example, the ordinary topological insulator in 3+1D lives in $\Omega^4_{\text{spin}}(U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2, \xi)$ where ξ is the fundamental 2d representation of $U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 = O(2)$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ plus two copies of the sign representation $O(2) \xrightarrow{\det} \mathbb{Z}_2 = O(1)$ on $\mathbb{R}$. This corresponds to the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ being orientation reversing and squaring to $(-1)^F$. Details are in Ref 28. It so happens $\Omega^4_{\text{spin}}(U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2, \xi) = \mathbb{Z}_2$.

If we add to the ordinary TI a reflection symmetry R, then the new cobordism group we need to compute is $\Omega^4_{\text{spin}}(U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^T \times \mathbb{Z}_2^R, \xi \otimes \sigma)$, where σ is the sign rep of $\mathbb{Z}_2^R$ acting on $\mathbb{R}$. This group contains at least a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$, with the first being the ordinary TI invariant and the second being the η invariant of the Pin^{c+} structure made out of the reflection symmetry. Indeed, a system with a $U(1)$ symmetry and a reflection symmetry is a lot like the $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{CT}$ TI. Indeed, for our classification there is no difference in the group data. As

is well known, this has a $\mathbb{Z}_8$ invariant. So we know these are cobordism invariants, we just have to determine whether they're non-trivial. From Ref 77, we know that in Pin^{c+} bordism, $\mathbb{CP}^2$ and $\mathbb{RP}^4$ are independent. Further, they each also have a $\text{Pin}^{\tilde{c}+}$ structure, so they define independent classes in $\Omega^4_{\text{spin}}(U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^T \times \mathbb{Z}_2^R, \xi \otimes \sigma)$. We know from, eg. Ref 28 that the $U(1) \rtimes T$ invariant is order 2 on both $\mathbb{CP}^2$ and $\mathbb{RP}^4$ and the $U(1) \times CT$ invariant is order 2 and order 8 on them respectively. This proves that $\Omega^4_{\text{spin}}(U(1) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^T \times \mathbb{Z}_2^R, \xi \otimes \sigma) \supset \mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_8$. In particular, since all the free fermion phases are classified by cyclic groups (see Ref. 45), some of these must be inherently interaction fermionic phases.

We can of course also consider situations where the space group G is a non-trivial extension of time reversal (there are 1651 magnetic space groups in 3d[78]) and charge symmetries. This gives the possibility of an endless zoo of topological superconductors and insulators, most of which will likely be beyond free fermions!

We can also go beyond cohomology in just bosonic phases. For phases with orientation-reversing symmetries this is very important. As we learned from Ref 22, we need to consider the unoriented bordism group. If K denotes the subgroup of G whose symmetries are orientation-preserving, then by the Crystalline Equivalence Principle the most general bosonic phases on spacetime $\mathbb{R}^D$ will be classified by $\Omega^D_O(K)$. For these we are allowed to use the Stiefel-Whitney classes[79] in our topological terms.

C. Topological Families of TQFT

Let us give another description of the integer quantum Hall state wrapped on a circle. Recall that the Chern-Simons form is related to the instanton number by

$$dCS(A) = F \wedge F.$$

Let $\theta(x)$ be a step function which goes from 0 to 2π in some very short region around $x = 1/2$. Let $X = Y \times S^1_x$ where the x coordinate is defined between 0 and 1. Then integrating by parts,

$$\int_X \theta(x) F \wedge F = \int_X \theta(x) dCS(A) = \int_X \delta(x - 1/2) CS(A) = \int_{Y \times 1/2} CS(A).$$

Thus, having a Chern-Simons term along Y at a particular spot around the circle is equivalent to having a topological θ angle which winds around the circle. Each of these θ terms for fixed θ define a trivial topological phase, since they are all connected to $\theta = 0$, but the winding of the θ angle describes a non-contractible loop in the space of gapped phases. We see that this defines a stable 3+1D phase.

What we have described can be summarized by saying that the IR limit of a gapped system on spacetime X^D defines not just a TQFT but most generally a *family of TQFTs parametrized by* X [10]. What this roughly means is that with a cell structure of X^D, D-cells

[10] "TFTQFT"

are decorated with TQFTs, $D-1$-cells form boundary defects between TQFTs, $D-2$-cells form defect junctions between those, and so on. One may say that we have a functor from the path ∞-groupoid of X into the ∞-category of D-dimensional TQFTs. Of course, for the result to only depend on the topology of X, and not its cell structure, these defects must all be invertible, so that the TQFTs in each D-cell are isomorphic. If X is contractible, then these defects can be "pushed away to infinity" so that we find a unique TQFT as the IR limit. This is the usual IR limit one normally considers. However, if X is of the form $\mathbb{R}^{D-1} \times S^1$, then the edge in the S^1 direction may be labelled with a non-trivial endomorphism of a D-dimensional TQFT T.

For instance, the IQH state forms an invertible defect between the vacuum 3+1d TQFT and itself. This can be used to decorate any edge of X. In particular, if X is $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$, then we may have an IQH state in the circular direction that we cannot get rid of. We considered an effective action for this 3+1D phase above.

Let us assume for a moment that the TQFTs in the D-cells may be fully extended and derive some structural results relating this to our G-twisted maps. The cobordism hypothesis[80–83] says roughly that a fully extended TQFT is determined by the $D-1$-category it assigns to a point. This $D-1$-category is really a special kind of object in a D-category $\mathcal{C}$. It is somewhat opaque what $\mathcal{C}$ is in physical applications, but luckily we can remain agnostic about this point, supposing such a thing exists. Then another way of saying we have a family of TQFTs parametrized by X is to say we have a functor from X (considered as its path ∞-groupoid) to $\mathcal{C}$. But this is exactly the data appearing in the cobordism hypothesis to define TQFTs on arbitrary D-manifolds M with a map to X. Let's say it again: *families of TQFTs parametrized by X are the same thing as TQFTs for manifolds $M \to X$.*

Now suppose we have some group G which acts on this family of TQFTs. The cell structure of X should be preserved by the action, so G will map D-cells to other D-cells. This means that on the D-cell B we have an isomorphism of TQFTs taking it to the TQFT on gB. This defines a G-equivariant family of TQFTs. We believe this to be the most general picture of crystalline symmetry enriched topological order. Broadly speaking a G equivariant family of anything parametrized by X is a family parametrized by $X//G$. See Ref 84 for an expansive perspective on this point. It follows that *a G-equivariant TQFT over X and therefore IR limit of a G-symmetric gapped system on X is the same thing as a TQFT for manifolds $M \to X//G$.* This proves our Conjecture 3 (and therefore everything else in the paper) in the case of gappable boundary (which implies full extendability).

It is possible to include in this classification those phases with non-invertible domain defects. Of course the issue is that in a spacetime X considered in a cellular decomposition, edges and faces and so on are not directed. We can only define an ∞-groupoid, with all invertible morphisms, and any functor out of such a thing can only describe invertible data. What we need to do is direct the edges and faces of X in such that we may think of X as an ∞-category. Such a thing is called a directed space.

For example, a circle with a directed edge can be thought of as a category with one object

and an endomorphism for every *nonnegative* integer. This integer tells how many times one winds around the circle. One can only go one way. For example, if $X = S^1_t \times \mathbb{R}^2$ with a preferred time direction, then it would be possible to describe a family of TQFTs which says the system pumps a toric code every time step, since now time evolution need not be invertible. Perhaps such a thing is possible in a system with an emergent arrow of time! We could also have the circular direction be a direction of space and this is a quotient of the stack of toric codes we've talked about before. So this exotic phase is not beyond TQFT afterall, but one needs some extra structure on X. This tells whether we stack toric codes or the CPT conjugate of toric codes. These edge directions in space are exactly like how the fracton excitations can only move in certain directions. Whether more general fracton phases can be encoded this way, we don't know, but while we suspect it is possible, it is probably not enlightening.

There are some sorts of directed space structures which have already appeared in physics. An important one is the Kastelyn orientation of a surface. These are (relative to a dimer configuration) equivalent to a choice of spin structure. Perhaps TFTQFTs on Kastelyn oriented surfaces have something to do with spin TQFTs. One can think about the maximum sort of this structure: a branching structure. It seems that a branching structure plays the role of a framing in the cobordism hypothesis. Indeed, it gives one all the proper orientations to decorate the cell structure of X with line operators, surface operators, ... and co-orient them properly so that they can be consistently fused. Then one can probably understand these questions about directed spaces and geometric structure on spacetime from the cobordism hypothesis.

V. OPEN PROBLEMS

In this work we have presented a general framework for understanding the classification of interacting topological crystalline phases, for both bosons and fermions. An important question for future work is to understand the physical signatures of these phases.

The classic signature of an SPT phase is the protected gapless modes on the boundary (though in strongly interacting systems the boundary can also spontaneously break the symmetry or be topologically ordered). One would expect similar statements to hold for crystalline SPT phases, but there are some caveats. Firstly, of course, a boundary will in general explicitly break the spatial symmetry down to a subgroup, and one only expects protected modes when the phase is still non-trivial with respect to this subgroup. But even then there are exceptions. For example, an SPT protected in 1-D by inversion symmetry about $x = 0$ does *not* have a protected degeneracy when placed on the interval $[-L, L]$, even though the entire boundary (comprising two points) is in fact invariant under the symmetry [10]. Therefore, it is still an open question to determine what is the criterion which ensures protected boundary modes. A way to answer this would be to extend our spatial symmetry gauging procedure to systems with boundary. This is, however, beyond the scope of the present work.

Another question is the robustness of the topological crystalline phases that we have found to disorder, which explicitly breaks the spatial symmetries. There are some topological crystalline phases which have been argued to be robust to disorder, so long as the spatial symmetry is respected *on average* [40]. It would be interesting to determine the general circumstances under which this happens.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank M. Barkeshli, P. Bonderson, N. Bultinck, X. Chen, M. Hermele, M. Metlitski, C. Nayak, S. Galatius, B. Ware, D. Williamson and C. von Keyserlingk for helpful discussions. We also thank M. Hermele for drawing our attention to a mistake in a previous version of Table I. RT is supported by an NSF GRFP grant. DVE is supported by the Microsoft Corporation. This work was conducted in part at the Boulder Summer School for Condensed Matter and Material Physics, which is supported by the NSF and the University of Colorado; and at the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, which is supported by NSF grant no. NSF PHY-1125915.

Appendices

A. COMPUTING THE BOSONIC CLASSIFICATION

A nice feature of our results, at least in the case of bosonic crystalline SPTs (in Euclidean space) is that the classification is readily computable. According to the general discussion of Section II B, we see that the classification in d space dimensions for a given space group G is given by $H^{d+2}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{or}})$. Computing this object turns out to be within the capabilities of the GAP computer algebra program [85]. We show the results in Table I (in the introduction) for the (2+1)-D case and in Table II for the (3+1)-D case. There were 3 space groups in (3+1)-D for which the classification took too long to compute and is not shown.

We recall that this classification is expected to be *complete* in (2+1)-D, and for the Sohncke groups (those not containing any orientation-reversing elements) in (3+1)-D. What about explicit constructions of these phases? Let us fix some element $\omega \in H^{d+2}(BG, \mathrm{Z}^{\mathrm{or}})$. Suppose that there exists a finite group G_f and a group homomorphism $\varphi : G \to G_f$ such that ω is in the image of the map $\mathcal{H}^{d+1}(G_f, \mathrm{U}(1)^{\mathrm{or}}) \cong H^{d+2}(BG_f, \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{or}}) \to H^{d+2}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{or}})$ induced by φ. Then indeed we have an explicit construction of the crystalline SPT corresponding to ω, using the bootstrap argument of Section I C (leveraging, for example, the construction of Ref. 17 for the SPT protected by G_f acting internally). We conjecture that there will always be some such G_f for any element of $H^{d+2}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{or}})$.

Number	Name	Classification
1	P1	0
2	$P\bar{1}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
3	P2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
4	$P2_1$	0
5	C2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
6	Pm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
7	Pc	0
8	Cm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
9	Cc	0
10	P2/m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 18}$
11	$P2_1/m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
12	C2/m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 11}$
13	P2/c	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
14	$P2_1/c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
15	C2/c	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
16	P222	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 16}$
17	$P222_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
18	$P2_12_12$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
19	$P2_12_12_1$	0
20	$C222_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
21	C222	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
22	F222	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
23	I222	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
24	$I2_12_12_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
25	Pmm2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 16}$
26	$Pmc2_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
27	Pcc2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
28	Pma2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
29	$Pca2_1$	0
30	Pnc2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
31	$Pmn2_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
32	Pba2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
33	$Pna2_1$	0
34	Pnn2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
35	Cmm2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
36	$Cmc2_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
37	Ccc2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
38	Amm2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
39	Aem2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
40	Ama2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
41	Aea2	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
42	Fmm2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
43	Fdd2	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
44	Imm2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
45	Iba2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
46	Ima2	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
47	Pmmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 42}$
48	Pnnn	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
49	Pccm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 17}$
50	Pban	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
51	Pmma	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 17}$
52	Pnna	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
53	Pmna	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
54	Pcca	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
55	Pbam	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
56	Pccn	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
57	Pbcm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
58	Pnnm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
59	Pmmn	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
60	Pbcn	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
61	Pbca	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
62	Pnma	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
63	Cmcm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
64	Cmce	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 7}$
65	Cmmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 26}$
66	Cccm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
67	Cmme	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 17}$
68	Ccce	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 7}$
69	Fmmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 20}$
70	Fddd	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
71	Immm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 22}$
72	Ibam	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
73	Ibca	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
74	Imma	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
75	P4	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{\times 2}$
76	$P4_1$	0
77	$P4_2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
78	$P4_3$	0
79	I4	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
80	$I4_1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
81	$P\bar{4}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{\times 2}$
82	$I\bar{4}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{\times 2}$
83	P4/m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 12} \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{\times 2}$
84	$P4_2/m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 11}$
85	P4/n	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{\times 2}$
86	$P4_2/n$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
87	I4/m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
88	$I4_1/a$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
89	P422	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 12}$
90	$P42_12$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
91	$P4_122$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
92	$P4_12_12$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
93	$P4_222$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 12}$
94	$P4_22_12$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
95	$P4_322$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
96	$P4_32_12$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
97	I422	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
98	$I4_122$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
99	P4mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 12}$
100	P4bm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
101	$P4_2cm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
102	$P4_2nm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
103	P4cc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
104	P4nc	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
105	$P4_2mc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
106	$P4_2bc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
107	I4mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 7}$
108	I4cm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
109	$I4_1md$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
110	$I4_1cd$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
111	$P\bar{4}2m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
112	$P\bar{4}2c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
113	$P\bar{4}2_1m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
114	$P\bar{4}2_1c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
115	$P\bar{4}m2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
116	$P\bar{4}c2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 7}$
117	$P\bar{4}b2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$

TABLE II. The "230-fold way". This table shows the classification of bosonic crystalline SPT phases in (3+1)-D for each of the 3-D space groups. For space groups 227, 228 and 230 the classification has not been computed.

Number	Name	Classification
118	$P\bar{4}n2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
119	$I\bar{4}m2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
120	$I\bar{4}c2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
121	$I\bar{4}2m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
122	$I\bar{4}2d$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
123	P4/mmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 32}$
124	P4/mcc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
125	P4/nbm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
126	P4/nnc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
127	P4/mbm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 15} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
128	P4/mnc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8} \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
129	P4/nmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
130	P4/ncc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
131	$P4_2/mmc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 24}$
132	$P4_2/mcm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 18}$
133	$P4_2/nbc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
134	$P4_2/nnm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
135	$P4_2/mbc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
136	$P4_2/mnm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 14}$
137	$P4_2/nmc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
138	$P4_2/ncm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
139	I4/mmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 20}$
140	I4/mcm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 14}$
141	$I4_1/amd$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
142	$I4_1/acd$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
143	P3	$\mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 3}$
144	$P3_1$	0
145	$P3_2$	0
146	R3	$\mathbb{Z}_3$
147	$P\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 2}$
148	$R\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
149	P312	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
150	P321	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
151	$P3_112$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
152	$P3_121$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
153	$P3_212$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
154	$P3_221$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
155	R32	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
156	P3m1	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
157	P31m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
158	P3c1	0
159	P31c	$\mathbb{Z}_3$
160	R3m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
161	R3c	0
162	$P\bar{3}1m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
163	$P\bar{3}1c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
164	$P\bar{3}m1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
165	$P\bar{3}c1$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
166	$R\bar{3}m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
167	$R\bar{3}c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
168	P6	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 2}$
169	$P6_1$	0
170	$P6_5$	0
171	$P6_2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
172	$P6_4$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
173	$P6_3$	$\mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 2}$
174	$P\bar{6}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 3}$
175	P6/m	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10} \times \mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 2}$
176	$P6_3/m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_3^{\times 2}$
177	P622	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
178	$P6_122$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
179	$P6_522$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
180	$P6_222$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
181	$P6_422$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
182	$P6_322$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
183	P6mm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8}$
184	P6cc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
185	$P6_3cm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
186	$P6_3mc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
187	$P\bar{6}m2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
188	$P\bar{6}c2$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3}$
189	$P\bar{6}2m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
190	$P\bar{6}2c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
191	P6/mmm	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 22}$
192	P6/mcc	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
193	$P6_3/mcm$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
194	$P6_3/mmc$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 9}$
195	P23	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
196	F23	$\mathbb{Z}_3$
197	I23	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
198	$P2_13$	$\mathbb{Z}_3$
199	$I2_13$	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
200	$Pm\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 14} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
201	$Pn\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
202	$Fm\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
203	$Fd\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
204	$Im\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 8} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
205	$Pa\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
206	$Ia\bar{3}$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_3$
207	P432	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
208	$P4_232$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 6}$
209	F432	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
210	$F4_132$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
211	I432	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
212	$P4_332$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
213	$P4_132$	$\mathbb{Z}_2$
214	$I4_132$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
215	$P\bar{4}3m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 7}$
216	$F\bar{4}3m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
217	$I\bar{4}3m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
218	$P\bar{4}3n$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 4}$
219	$F\bar{4}3c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 2}$
220	$I\bar{4}3d$	$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$
221	$Pm\bar{3}m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 18}$
222	$Pn\bar{3}n$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 5}$
223	$Pm\bar{3}n$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
224	$Pn\bar{3}m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 10}$
225	$Fm\bar{3}m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
226	$Fm\bar{3}c$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 7}$
227	$Fd\bar{3}m$	???
228	$Fd\bar{3}c$	???
229	$Im\bar{3}m$	$\mathbb{Z}_2^{\times 13}$
230	$Ia\bar{3}d$	???

TABLE II. (continued)



FIG. 10. When the g domain wall is pulled off of this edge, it is revealed to be an edge from $x \to gy$.

B. LATTICE CRYSTALLINE GAUGE FIELDS

The cellular description we give in this section is dual to our sketch we gave above, there, g elements labelled codimension 1 walls between volumes in the crystal, here in order to compare with the usual definition of a lattice gauge field, we label edges with g elements.

Recall for a discrete group G a lattice gauge field has a very nice description where each edge e gets a group label $g_e \in G$ and any 2-face τ imposes a flatness constraint

$$\prod_{e \in \partial \tau} g_e = 1, \tag{2.1}$$

where the multiplication is performed in the order the edges are encountered in a circular traversal of the boundary. This conservation law allows us to express these labels as a configuration of domain walls running about our manifold. The conservation law says that a g_1 and a g_2 fuse to a $g_1 g_2$. The domain walls are codimension one so fusion can be non-commutative in this way.

Let's imagine drawing a configuration like this on X where the G elements act non-trivially on X. Does this make sense? Let's look at a particular edge, Fig 10. It looks like an edge from $x \to y$, but if we push the domain wall out of the way, we see the actual data there is an edge (actually path; see below) from x to gy! This means that while our underlying manifold has points labelled by points in X, it is perhaps a different space M! To see what data is assigned to a face or higher facet, one performs a similar procedure, pushing all the domain walls off and collecting g labels. The flatness condition on G implies that this is always unambiguous. At a symmetry defect like the core of a disclination, the flatness condition is violated and it is impossible to unambiguously assign a face of X to the core of the defect. When this happens, the underlying space M may have different topology from X! In fact, we may end up with a space M whose labels don't even close up unto a map to X! In such a case, we end up with only a G-twisted map $M \dashrightarrow X$.

Note that if X is contractible the extra information beyond the G gauge field, the X



FIG. 11. Here we depict of a piece of M (northwest) mapping to a piece of X (southeast). We have given the vertices of X unique labels and labelled the vertices of M with their image vertices in X. Note that vertex 2 has two adjacent preimages. This edge of M is mapped to a degenerate edge and the triangle it lies on (grey) is mapped to a degenerate face 122 in X. Note also that vertex $5 \in X$ has no preimage and to map faces to faces we must refine the lattice of M, depicted by the dotted blue lines.

labels, contributes no non-trivial data up to homotopies of this map. Indeed this is basically another proof of the Crystalline Equivalence Principle.

Let us try to be systematic about this construction. We start with a warm-up, just describing cellular maps $\hat{f} : M \to X$ in a lattice gauge theoryish way. A cellular map means the n-skeleton of M gets sent to the n-skeleton of X for every n. This means every vertex $m \in M$ gets a vertex $\hat{f}(m) \in X$, every edge $e : m_1 \to m_2 \in M$ gets a *path* $\hat{f}(e) : \hat{f}(m_1) \rightsquigarrow \hat{f}(m_2) \in M$, every plaquette τ gets a chain $\hat{f}(\tau)$ with $\partial \hat{f}(\tau) = \hat{f}(\partial\tau)$, every volume gets a 3-chain with prescribed boundary and so on. This data describes a general partial covering $M \to X$.

To account for maps which are not locally homeomorphisms, we need to include in this definition the *degenerate facets of* X. For example, if we had the constant map $M \mapsto x \in X$, this definition only makes sense if there is a hidden edge $\mathrm{id} : x \to x$, hidden faces $x \to x \to x$, $x \to x \to y$, and so on. All higher degenerate facets should be included as well.

This means that any map $\hat{f} : M \to X$ is homotopic to one given first by refinement of the lattice in M and then by labelling vertices, edges, faces, ... of the refinement with vertices, edges, faces, ... (possibly degenerate ones) of X. This should be intuitive, since the cell structure in M is not really physical. It's just a way to encode the topology of M combinatorially.

Now let us consider G-twisted maps. As before we assign vertices of X to vertices of M. Before to an edge in M we would assign a path $x \rightsquigarrow y$ connecting the X labels x and y of the endpoints. For G-twisted maps, these paths can pass through domain walls, resulting



FIG. 12. The conservation law for G labels allows us to draw them as G domain walls in X. Then in any contractible patch of M we can describe our G-twisted map by "pushing off the domain walls". Then we look at the northwest picture of our patch in M. See how the vertices have been transformed; so have the edges. Then we fill in the transformed picture with faces of X as we would in describing an ordinary map $M \to X$. This always requires a choice of basepoint. Here our basepoint is 4 and we have pushed all the domain walls (green) straight to the east. The choice of basepoint is like a local choice of gauge.

in something we call a G-path:

$$x_1 \rightsquigarrow y_1 \xrightarrow{g_1} x_2 \rightsquigarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{g_k} y_k.$$

Around the boundary of a face $\tau \in M$, we get a G-path by concatenating the G-paths on each edge. Our conservation law

$$\prod_j g_j = 1$$

must be supplemented by the condition that the boundary G-path forms a G-loop:

$$y_k = x_1.$$

If this is the case, then we can push all the g's to the right, acting on the paths as we do to obtain an honest path $x_1 \rightsquigarrow g_k^{-1} \cdots g_1^{-1} x_1$. If the G conservation law holds then this path is a loop in X. This is just like pushing the domain walls off τ towards vertex 1. We ask that τ be assigned a chain with boundary equal to this loop. A picture of this is depicted in Fig 12. One sees in this cellular description how the G-twisted maps at once generalize gauge fields and crystal defects.

Now we discuss homotopies of this data (collapsible crystalline gauge transformations). Such a homotopy $A(0) \mapsto A(1)$ is itself a crystalline gauge field $A(t)$ but on the prism $M \times [0,1]$ with boundary conditions equal to $A(0)$ and $A(1)$ on each copy of M.

As a first warm-up, let's just consider ordinary G gauge fields. See Fig 13. There is a cell



FIG. 13. A prism $M \times [0,1]$ mapping to BG means an assigning of G labels also to the interior edges. These correspond with the vertices of M so we can think of them as a function $g : M^0 \to G$ where M^0 is the set of vertices of M. Then the conservation law on the internal faces of the prism forces a constraint between corresponding edge labels in each M. The constraint reads that the top labels are the gauge transformation of the bottom labels by g. The direction is fixed by an orientation of the internal prism edges. If we reverse all of them, it takes $g \mapsto g^{-1}$ (and locally as well).

complex of $M \times [0,1]$ with one inner $p+1$-cell for every p cell of M. These inner cells are the only ones where the boundary conditions do not fix the data. For an ordinary G gauge field we must specify the G labels on the inner edges. These correspond to vertices of M, so the data is like an element of G for each vertex of M. The flatness condition on the inner faces determines how these must act on the edge variables.

A second warm-up, really getting going this time, is to consider homotopies of a map $M \to X$. This is the case with no symmetry, $G = 1$. This gets quite complicated but it is possible to divide homotopies into elementary pieces, where all the inner p-cells but one are degenerate but one: τ_p, meaning the map $M \to X$ does not change away from τ_p. The map $h : M \times [0,1] \to X$ identifies τ_p with a p-chain $h(\tau_p)$ and because all other inner cells in $M \times [0,1]$ are degenerate, $\partial h(\tau_p)$ is divided into two $p-1$-chains in the image of the boundaries: $\partial h(\tau_p) = h(N_0) \sqcup h(N_1)$, where $N_j \subset M \times \{j\}$ are $p-1$-chains in M. In fact these are the same $p-1$-chains and $h(\tau_p)$ is telling us how they move inside X during the homotopy h.

A general gauge transformation of $A : M \dashrightarrow X$ is essentially a combination of these two ingredients.

Just as the cellular description of G gauge fields reflects a convenient cellular structure of BG, what we have described above amounts to a cellular structure on the homotopy quotient $X//G$, pronounced "X mod mod G". One can see what we've written as a simultaneous construction of $X//G$ and a proof of

Theorem 3. *A G-twisted map $M \dashrightarrow X$, ie. a collapsible crystalline gauge field, is the*

same as a cellular map $A : M \to X//G$ with the cell structure induced by the action of G on a compatible cell structure of X. Thus, collapsible gauge equivalence classes of crystalline gauge fields are the same as homotopy classes of maps $A : M \to X//G$.

There is a nice way to get a handle on the homotopy type of $X//G$. Recall from, eg. Ref. 86, that BG, the classifying space for ordinary G-gauge fields and the special case of our construction when X is a point, is itself constructed as an ordinary quotient EG/G, where EG is some (usually very large) *contractible* space on which G acts freely. For discrete groups, EG can be constructed as a simplicial complex where vertices are group elements $g \in G$, edges are pairs, triangles are triples, and so on. The gluing maps use the G multiplication. For example, an edge (g_0, g_1) is glued to g_1 and to $g_0 g_1$; a triangle (g_0, g_1, g_2) is glued to (g_1, g_2), $(g_0, g_1 g_2)$; and $(g_0 g_1, g_2)$, and so on. This space has a G action which acts on all the labels simultaneously. It's also contractible. The quotient structure is the usual structure on BG. Likewise, we can invent a cell structure on the space $EG \times X$ so that the quotient structure is the one we've described on $X//G$. This proves $X//G = EG \times X/G$ where G acts diagonally. In fact, to preserve the homotopy type of $X//G$, we just need any space EX which is homotopy equivalent to X and on which G acts freely. $EG \times X$ is an example, but if G already acts freely on X, then X itself is an example and the homotopy quotient reduces to the ordinary quotient $X//G = X/G$. In the other extreme, which G is a purely internal symmetry, $X//G = BG \times X$.

C. TOPOLOGICAL TERMS VS. TOPOLOGICAL PHASES

Let us discuss Dijkgraaf and Witten's construction of the topological action in more detail. The important observation is the existence of a classifying space BG: homotopy classes of gauge fields for discrete internal symmetry group G are in one-to-one correspondence with continuous maps from $M \to BG$. BG may be constructed as a quotient EG/G where EG is any contractible space on which G acts freely, ie. by translations. EG and hence BG are often infinite dimensional, in fact necessarily so if G has any torsion. This allows there to be nontrivial SPT phases in infinitely many dimensions. From this definition, one easily verifies that the homotopy class of BG is determined only by the group G. Moreover, the cohomology of the group can be defined to be the cohomology of the classifying space (but see below for some subtleties for non-finite groups) $H^*(BG)$. [11]

Our convention is to coordinatize $U(1)$ as $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Given $\omega \in H^D(BG, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ on BG, we write the action

$$S[A] = 2\pi \int_M A^* \omega, \tag{3.1}$$

[11] This correspondence can be used to connect many algebraic facts about groups to topological properties of the classifying space and vice versa. For example, a representation $G \to O(n)$ corresponds to a $\mathbb{R}^n$ vector bundle over BG. The characteristic class w_1 of this bundle determines whether it is an orientable bundle. The characteristic class w_2 determines whether it lifts to a spin representation $G \to Spin(n)$. Furthermore, computing the cohomology of BG is often easier than attempting a direct calculation of the group cohomology of G.

where A is a gauge field on M considered as a map $A : M \to BG$ and $A^*\omega$ is the pullback of forms. Because ω has coefficients defined only mod integers, $S[A]$ is defined modulo 2π times integers. This is because the physical quantity is really e^{iS}.

For infinite discrete groups, one cannot subsequently sum over the gauge field in the path integral to obtain a gauge theory because there are infinitely many gauge equivalence classes of gauge field. However, it still makes sense to consider these gauge fields as backgrounds, if not dynamical, in which case again the topological terms which can be written as local integrals of just the gauge field are classified by $H^D(BG, U(1))$.

An important caveat is that the topological terms in $H^D(BG, U(1))$ do not necessarily correspond to topological phases. For example, with $U(1)$ symmetry in 3+1d one can have a theta angle for the $U(1)$ gauge field, but this does not mean there is an entire circle of different topological phases. Instead, the existence of the theta term descends to the existence of the Chern-Simons term in 2+1d, whose coefficients are *quantized*, as phases of matter should be. The famous relationship is

$$dCS(A) = F \wedge F, \tag{3.2}$$

where $CS(A)$ is the Chern-Simons form of A.

For connected symmetry group G like $U(1)$ or $SU(2)$ (and indeed for any group) the proper cohomology to consider actually lives *one dimension higher than spacetime* and over the integers: $H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z})$. Let us remark that physicists often prefer[17] to write the classification as $\mathcal{H}^D(G, U(1))$, where $\mathcal{H}^*$ denotes the "measurable" or "Borel" group cohomology. This can be proven to be isomorphic to $H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z})$.

For finite G, $H^D(BG, \mathbb{Z})$ coincides with $H^D(BG, U(1))$. The problem is infinite order elements in the homology of BG with which one can define theta angles. These were encountered in Refs 22 and 28 and the solution there was to use only the torsion part of homology: $H_D(BG)^{tors}$ and consider maps from that group to $U(1)$: $\mathrm{Hom}(H_D(BG)^{tors}, U(1))$. Since abelian groups always split between their torsion and free part, there is an inclusion of this into $H^D(BG, U(1))$ but more importantly also into $H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z})$ by measuring the winding number of the form, much like in Eq 3.2. These are the sort of gappable-edge SPT phases encountered in studying finite symmetries. The non-torsion pieces in homology define things like Chern-Simons terms, which are descended from 4d integer characteristic classes like p_1 and c_2 and their corresponding theta terms θp_1, θc_2. Our belief is that the universal coefficient sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(H_{D+1}(BG), \mathbb{Z}) \simeq H_{D+1}(BG)^{free} \\ \uparrow & & \\ \mathrm{Hom}(H_D(BG)^{tors}, U(1)) = \mathrm{Ext}(H_D(BG), \mathbb{Z}) & & \end{array} \tag{3.3}$$

reflects a physical short exact sequence with the same functorial and splitting properties

$$\{\text{torsion phases}\} \to \{\text{topological phases}\} \to \{\text{non} - \text{torsion response}\}.$$

This is discussed also in Ref 28 where the inclusion of infinite order homology elements in shifted degree corresponds to thermal Hall-type gravitational response and Ref 87 where it is related to the cobordism hypothesis and the Anderson dual of the sphere spectrum, which in topology plays the role of $U(1)$, the Pontryagin dual of $\mathbb{Z}$.

D. COCYCLES

In this appendix, we delve a little deeper into what the equivariant cocycles mean. We will find they nicely formulate what it means for the cocycle (and hence the topological response) to be spatially dependent. One can see this as another derivation of the equivariant cohomology classification. Importantly, we will learn how to integrate these cocycles.

A. Derivatives

We consider spacetime X with its lattice it as a CW space. We want to define a "cocycle which depends on position":

$$\omega_0(x, g_1, ..., g_d) \in C^D(BG, C^0(X, U(1)^{or})).$$

vHere D is the dimension of X. The local coefficients $U(1)^{or}$ are there because we want our cocycle to be a pseudoscalar function, so that orientation reversing elements of G conjugate the phase. This is important for getting the correct action of G on C^0 and the correct classification in the case of time reversal symmetry and other orientation-reversing spacetime symmetries. In the rest of the section, we will take this coefficient system to be understood, just writing $C^j(X)$. Note that we cannot exchange the order of X and BG in the above and get the right answers. In a sense, what we have is a group cochain valued in pseudoscalar functions on X, ie. volume forms on X.

We can define two differentials for such an object. The first measures a change in ω_0 under a gauge transformation:

$$d_G\omega_0(x, g_1, ..., g_{D+1}) = \omega_0(x \cdot g_1, g_2, ..., g_{D+1})$$

$$-\omega_0(x, g_1g_2, g_3, ..., g_{D+1}) + \omega_0(x, g_1, g_2g_3, ..., g_{D+1}) + (-1)^{d+2}\omega_0(x, g_1, ..., g_d),$$

where in the first term we have used the action of G on X which we write as a right action. This reflects that when we write $C^D(BG, C^0(X))$ we are considering $C^0(X)$ as a local coefficient system on BG induced by the action of G on X. To have a gauge invariant

cocycle, we need

$$d_G\omega_0 = 0.$$

When this is true, we have a group cocycle valued in volume forms on X.

There is another differential that measures whether the integral of this volume form defines a topological invariant of X:

$$d_X\omega_0(x, y, g_1, ..., g_d) = \omega_0(y, g_1, ..., g_d) - \omega_0(x, g_1, ..., g_d).$$

For ω_0, $d_X\omega_0 = 0$ means that our cocycle is constant. However, it makes more sense to say that it is constant up to a gauge transformation. Thus, we should instead require

$$d_X\omega_0 = -d_G\omega_1$$

for some

$$\omega_1 \in C^{D-1}(BG, C^1(X)).$$

It might not be possible to solve this equation. Indeed, we are asking that

$$d_1\omega_0 := [d_X\omega_0] \in H^d(BG, H^1(X, U(1)^{or}))$$

be zero. If it is, then we can find ω_1 and make a redefinition of our cocycle

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \omega_1.$$

To say that a homotopy of X with its G action can be compensated by a gauge transformation (and vice versa) we need to say $(d_G + d_X)\omega = 0$. Inspecting what we have so far, we find

$$(d_G + d_X)\omega = d_X\omega_1,$$

so we would like to find an $\omega_2 \in C^{d-2}(BG, C^2(X))$ with

$$d_X\omega_1 = -d_G\omega_2.$$

The obstruction is

$$d_2\omega_0 := [d_X\omega_1] \in H^{d-1}(BG, H^2(X, U(1)^{or})).$$

The pattern continues until the last obstruction

$$d_d \in H^0(BG, H^{D+1}(X, U(1)^{or})).$$

If we can solve all these descent equations, then we obtain a cocycle for both d_X and d_G, ie. both topological and gauge invariant:

$$\omega = \omega_0 + ... + \omega_D.$$

Such a thing is called an equivariant cocycle and defines a class in ordinary equivariant cohomology $H^D_G(X)$.

Note we didn't have to start with $\omega_0 \in C^D(BG, C^0(X))$ but could've instead started with a class in any of these groups:

$$\omega_0 \in C^p(BG, C^q(X))$$

with $p+q = D$. Indeed, given any class $[\omega_0] \in H^p(BG, H^q(X, U(1)^{or}))$, we can compute these differentials. If they all vanish, ω_0 defines a class in equivariant cohomology $H^D_G(X, U(1)^{or})$. All classes in equivariant cohomology arise this way, but there may be new relations between classes and the group structure of $H^D_G(X)$ may be some extension, with classes in $H^p(BG, H^q(X, U(1)^{or}))$ combining into a class that comes from $H^{p+1}(BG, H^{q-1}(X, U(1)^{or}))$. The extension always goes in that direction and is always abelian.

The groups

$$E_2^{p,q} := H^p(BG, H^q(X, U(1)^{or}))$$

have a very nice interpretation by decorating domain walls. It describes how codimension p symmetry defects are decorated with q forms, similar to what we considered in section V.C and in Ref 55.

B. Integrals

In this section we discuss effective topological actions, connecting back to our previous picture of background spacetime crystalline gauge field $A : M \to X//G$. Now M and X represent spacetime manifolds, whereas in the previous sections they represented space manifolds. The cellular description of maps $A : M \to X//G$ is the same, however.

In order to evaluate the pullback $A^*\omega$ of a class $\omega \in H^D_G(X)$ on a D-facet in M, we decompose $\omega = \omega_0 + \omega_1 + ... + \omega_D$, where $\omega_j \in C^{D-j}(BG, C^j(X))$ and evaluate each ω_j and sum. The evaluation of ω_j works just like cup product. This is simplest to describe in a simplical refinement of the cell structure on M. All simplicies in M are assumed to have ordered vertices. The first $D-j+1$ vertices with the G labels on edges between them form a $D-j$-simplex in BG on which we evaluate ω_j to obtain an element of $C^j(X)$. The last $j+1$ vertices with their edges and faces as above are

$$x_{D-j} \rightsquigarrow y_{D-j} \xrightarrow{g_{D-j}} x_{D-j+1} \rightsquigarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{g_D} y_D$$

to which we can push all the g's to the right to obtain a j-chain in X on which we evaluate that cochain, obtaining a number. The sum of these numbers is the value of $A^*\omega$ on this D-simplex of M.

---

[1] X.-G. Wen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **04**, 239 (1990).

[2] J. Maciejko, X.-L. Qi, A. Karch, and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 246809 (2010), arXiv:1004.3628.

[3] A. M. Essin and M. Hermele, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 104406 (2013), arXiv:1212.0593.

[4] Y.-M. Lu and A. Vishwanath, "Classification and Properties of Symmetry Enriched Topological Phases: A Chern-Simons approach with applications to Z2 spin liquids," (2013), arXiv:1302.2634.

[5] A. Mesaros and Y. Ran, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155115 (2013), arXiv:1212.0835.

[6] L.-Y. Hung and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 165107 (2013), arXiv:1212.1827.

[7] M. Barkeshli, P. Bonderson, M. Cheng, and Z. Wang, "Symmetry, Defects, and Gauging of Topological Phases," (2014), arXiv:1410.4540.

[8] M. Cheng, M. Zaletel, M. Barkeshli, A. Vishwanath, and P. Bonderson, "Translational symmetry and microscopic constraints on symmetry-enriched topological phases: a view from the surface," (2015), arXiv:1511.02263.

[9] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 155131 (2009), arXiv:0903.1069.

[10] F. Pollmann, A. M. Turner, E. Berg, and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 064439 (2010), arXiv:0910.1811.

[11] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 075125 (2012), arXiv:0909.4059.

[12] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 134509 (2010), arXiv:0904.2197.

[13] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 155138 (2010), arXiv:1004.3835.

[14] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 035107 (2011), arXiv:1008.3745.

[15] N. Schuch, D. Pérez-García, and I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 165139 (2011), arXiv:1010.3732.

[16] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 075103 (2011), arXiv:1008.4138.

[17] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 155114 (2013), arXiv:1106.4772.

[18] X. Chen, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 235141 (2011), arXiv:1106.4752.

[19] M. Levin and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115109 (2012), arXiv:1202.3120.

[20] A. Vishwanath and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. X **3**, 011016 (2013), arXiv:1209.3058.

[21] C. Wang, A. C. Potter, and T. Senthil, Science **343**, 629 (2014), arXiv:1306.3238.

[22] A. Kapustin, "Symmetry Protected Topological Phases, Anomalies, and Cobordisms: Beyond Group Cohomology," (2014), arXiv:1403.1467.

[23] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 115141 (2014), arXiv:1201.2648.

[24] D. V. Else and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 235137 (2014), arXiv:1409.5436.

[25] F. J. Burnell, X. Chen, L. Fidkowski, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 245122 (2014), arXiv:1302.7072.

[26] J. C. Wang, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 031601 (2015), arXiv:1405.7689.

[27] M. Cheng, Z. Bi, Y.-Z. You, and Z.-C. Gu, "Towards a Complete Classification of Symmetry-Protected Phases for Interacting Fermions in Two Dimensions," (2015), arXiv:1501.01313.

[28] A. Kapustin, R. Thorngren, A. Turzillo, and Z. Wang, J. High Energy Phys. **2015**, 1 (2015), arXiv:1406.7329.

[29] L. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 106802 (2011), arXiv:1010.1802.

[30] T. H. Hsieh, H. Lin, J. Liu, W. Duan, A. Bansi, and L. Fu, Nat. Commun. **3**, 982 (2012), arXiv:1202.1003.

[31] P. Dziawa, B. J. Kowalski, K. Dybko, R. Buczko, A. Szczerbakow, M. Szot, E. Łusakowska, T. Balasubramanian, B. M. Wojek, M. H. Berntsen, O. Tjernberg, and T. Story, Nat. Mater. **11**, 1023 (2012), arXiv:1206.1705.

[32] Y. Tanaka, Z. Ren, T. Sato, K. Nakayama, S. Souma, T. Takahashi, K. Segawa, and Y. Ando, Nat. Phys. **8**, 800 (2012), arXiv:arXiv:1304.0430.

[33] S.-Y. Xu, C. Liu, N. Alidoust, M. Neupane, D. Qian, I. Belopolski, J. D. Denlinger, Y. J. Wang, H. Lin, L. a. Wray, G. Landolt, B. Slomski, J. H. Dil, a. Marcinkova, E. Morosan, Q. Gibson, R. Sankar, F. C. Chou, R. J. Cava, a. Bansil, and M. Z. Hasan, Nat. Commun. **3**, 1192 (2012), arXiv:arXiv:1210.2917v1.

[34] C. Fang, M. J. Gilbert, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. B **86** (2012), 10.1103/PhysRevB.86.115112, arXiv:1207.5767.

[35] C. Fang, M. J. Gilbert, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. B **87** (2013), 10.1103/PhysRevB.87.035119, arXiv:1208.4603.

[36] C.-K. Chiu, H. Yao, and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 075142 (2013), arXiv:1303.1843.

[37] T. Morimoto and A. Furusaki, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 125129 (2013), arXiv:1306.2505.

[38] R.-J. Slager, A. Mesaros, V. Juričić, and J. Zaanen, Nat. Phys. **9**, 98 (2013), arXiv:arXiv:1209.2610v2.

[39] K. Shiozaki and M. Sato, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 165114 (2014), arXiv:1403.3331.

[40] C.-K. Chiu, J. C. Y. Teo, A. P. Schnyder, and S. Ryu, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 035005 (2016), arXiv:1505.03535.

[41] H. Isobe and L. Fu, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 081304 (2015), arXiv:1502.06962.

[42] C.-T. Hsieh, T. Morimoto, and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 245111 (2014), arXiv:1406.0307.

[43] Y. Qi and L. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 236801 (2015), arXiv:1505.06201.

[44] T. Yoshida and A. Furusaki, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 085114 (2015), arXiv:arXiv:1505.06598v1.

[45] X.-Y. Song and A. P. Schnyder, "Interaction effects on the classification of crystalline topological insulators and superconductors," (2016), arXiv:1609.07469.

[46] X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165113 (2002), arXiv:cond-mat/0107071.

[47] C.-T. Hsieh, O. M. Sule, G. Y. Cho, S. Ryu, and R. G. Leigh, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 165134 (2014), arXiv:1403.6902.

[48] G. Y. Cho, C.-T. Hsieh, T. Morimoto, and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 195142 (2015), arXiv:1501.07285.

[49] T. Yoshida, T. Morimoto, and A. Furusaki, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 245122 (2015), arXiv:1509.04395.

[50] M. F. Lapa, J. C. Y. Teo, and T. L. Hughes, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 115131 (2016), arXiv:1409.1234.

[51] Y.-Z. You and C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 245120 (2014), arXiv:arXiv:1409.0168v1.

[52] M. Hermele and X. Chen, Phys. Rev. X **6**, 041006 (2016), arXiv:1508.00573.

[53] M. Cheng, M. Zaletel, M. Barkeshli, A. Vishwanath, and P. Bonderson, "Translational symmetry and microscopic constraints on symmetry-enriched topological phases: a view from the

surface," (2015), arXiv:1511.02263.
[54] S. Jiang and Y. Ran, (2016), arXiv:1611.07652.
[55] H. Song, S.-J. Huang, L. Fu, and M. Hermele, "Topological phases protected by point group symmetry," (2016), arXiv:1604.08151.
[56] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 235128 (2011), arXiv:1103.3323.
[57] R. Dijkgraaf and E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. **129**, 393 (1990).
[58] J. Haah, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 042330 (2011), arXiv:1101.1962.
[59] B. Yoshida, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 125122 (2013), arXiv:1302.6248.
[60] S. Vijay, J. Haah, and L. Fu, "Fracton Topological Order, Generalized Lattice Gauge Theory and Duality," (2016), arXiv:1603.04442.
[61] D. J. Williamson, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 155128 (2016), arXiv:1603.05182.
[62] D. V. Else and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 201103 (2016), arXiv:1602.04804.
[63] B. Zeng and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 125121 (2015), arXiv:1406.5090.
[64] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 104431 (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0305505.
[65] M. B. Hastings and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 045141 (2005), arXiv:cond-mat/0503554.
[66] T. J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032321 (2007), arXiv:quant-ph/0601019.
[67] H. Hiller, Am. Math. Mon. **93**, 765 (1986).
[68] V. Khemani, A. Lazarides, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 250401 (2016), arXiv:1508.03344.
[69] C. W. von Keyserlingk and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 245145 (2016), arXiv:1602.02157.
[70] A. C. Potter, T. Morimoto, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. X **6**, 041001 (2016), arXiv:1602.05194.
[71] R. Roy and F. Harper, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 125105 (2016), arXiv:1602.08089.
[72] H. C. Po, L. Fidkowski, T. Morimoto, A. C. Potter, and A. Vishwanath, "Chiral Floquet Phases of Many-body Localized Bosons," (2016), arXiv:1609.00006.
[73] A. C. Potter and T. Morimoto, (2016), arXiv:1610.03485.
[74] R. Roy and F. Harper, "Floquet topological phases with symmetry in all dimensions," (2016), arXiv:1610.06899.
[75] X. Chen, Y.-M. Lu, and A. Vishwanath, Nat. Commun. **5**, 3507 (2014), arXiv:1303.4301.
[76] K. Shiozaki, H. Shapourian, and S. Ryu, "Many-body topological invariants in fermionic symmetry protected topological phases," (2016), arXiv:1609.05970.
[77] A. Bahri and P. Gilkey, Pac. J. Math. **128**, 1 (1987).
[78] D. B. Litvin, *Magnetic Group Tables* (International Union of Crystallography, 2013).
[79] R. Thorngren, J. High Energy Phys. **2015**, 1 (2015), arXiv:1404.4385.
[80] J. C. Baez and J. Dolan, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6073 (1995), arXiv:q-alg/9503002.
[81] J. Lurie, "On the Classification of Topological Field Theories," (2009), arXiv:0905.0465.
[82] A. Kapustin, "Topological Field Theory, Higher Categories, and Their Applications," (2010), arXiv:1004.2307.
[83] A. Kapustin and N. Saulina, Nucl. Phys. B **845**, 393 (2011), arXiv:1008.0654.
[84] T. Nikolaus, U. Schreiber, and D. Stevenson, J. Homotopy Relat. Struct. **10**, 749 (2015),

arXiv:1207.0248.

[85] "GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.8.4," `http://www.gap-system.org` (2016).

[86] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[87] D. S. Freed and M. J. Hopkins, "Reflection positivity and invertible topological phases," (2016), arXiv:1604.06527.